

© 1976

LARRY DEAN BEARD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES OF IOWA HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
REGARDING TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Educational Administration

by
Larry D. Beard
September 1975

PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES OF IOWA HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
REGARDING TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA

by

Larry D. Beard

Approved by Committee:

Richard Lampshire
Chairman

Richard D. Brooks

Jack Jones

James Halverson

Larry Landis

Earle L. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES OF IOWA HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
REGARDING TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA

An abstract of a Dissertation by
Larry D. Beard
September 1975
Drake University
Advisor: Richard Lampshire

The purpose of the study was first to identify criteria for a teacher evaluation program. Criteria were identified as being important ingredients in a teacher evaluation program. The criteria were incorporated into a questionnaire that was sent out to a representative sample of 228 high school principals in the State of Iowa. The next major function of the study was to see if high school principals were following the criteria identified in the questionnaire. The last major function of the study was to determine the degree of importance the principals put on the criteria, regardless of their practice.

The results of the study indicate that a majority of Iowa high school principals are practicing the criteria that were indicated on the questionnaire. Twenty out of 26 teacher evaluation criteria received a majority of principals indicating that they were following the practice. A majority of principals indicated that 22 of the 26 criteria were either very important or moderately important. In addition, the study indicated that regardless of the size of the high school, there are similarities in the teacher evaluation programs of all schools.

The study is recommended to be used by administrators who are developing a teacher evaluation program, as it identifies evaluation criteria, as well as the importance of the criteria. The study also recommends that administrators make teacher evaluation a top priority in their school district, and make the improvement of the instructional performance of the teacher the main goal of the teacher evaluation program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Procedure	7
Definition of Terms	10
Assumptions	11
Limitations of the Study	11
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Importance of Teacher Evaluation	12
Criticism of Administrative Evaluation	23
Criteria for Teacher Evaluation	35
3. PRESENTATION OF DATA	66
4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	214
Summary	214
Conclusions	224
Recommendations	226
BIBLIOGRAPHY	228
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire	233
APPENDIX B. Principals Receiving Questionnaires	241
APPENDIX C. Original Letter to Principals and Follow-up Letter	262

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, This School District has a Written Philosophy Stating District Goals and/or Objectives.....	73
2. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, This School District has a Written Philosophy Stating District Goals and/or Objectives.....	75
3. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, All Members of the Principal's Teaching Staff have their Instructional Objectives Identified in Printed Form.....	77
4. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, All members of the Principal's Teaching Staff have their Instructional Objectives Identified in Printed Form.....	80
5. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Formal Written Description of the Teacher Evaluation Process	82
6. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Formal Written Description of the Teacher Evaluation Process	84
7. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers were Involved in the Development of the Evaluation Program	86
8. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers were Involved in the Development of the Evaluation Program....	89

Table

Page

9.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, Teacher Evaluation is one of the Top Priorities of This School District	91
10.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Teacher Evaluation is One of the Top Priorities of this School District	93
11.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teacher Evaluation Program Assesses Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of Each Teacher	95
12.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teacher Evaluation Program Assesses Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of Each Teacher	98
13.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Main Goal of the Teacher Evaluation Program is the Improvement of Instruction	100
14.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Main Goal of the Teacher Evaluation Program is the Improvement of Instruction	102
15.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has an Appeal Procedure Established for the Teacher in Case the Teacher Disagrees with the Administrative Evaluation	105
16.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has an Appeal Procedure Established for the Teacher in Case the Teacher Disagrees with the Administrative Evaluation	107

Table

Page

17.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Know What is Written in their Evaluation File	109
18.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Know what is Written in their Evaluation File	112
19.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Written Dismissal Procedure for Teachers	114
20.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Written Dismissal Procedure for Teachers	116
21.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Understand the Whole Process of the Teacher Evaluation Program	118
22.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Understand the Whole Process of the Teacher Evaluation Program	121
23.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Policy of Constantly Evaluating and Updating the Teacher Evaluation Program	123
24.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Policy of Constantly Evaluating and Updating the Teacher Evaluation Program	125

25.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Outstanding Teacher, as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program is recognized and/or Rewarded in Some way Other than a Written Evaluation	127
26.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Outstanding Teacher, as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program is Recognized and/or Rewarded in Some Way Other than a Written Evaluation	129
27.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement Regarding Rewards to the Outstanding Teacher as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program..	132
28.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, Formal Observations, Involving Classroom Visitations in Order to Objectively Evaluate the Teacher's Instructional Performance is utilized in the Principal's Evaluation Program	133
29.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Formal Observations, Involving Classroom Visitations in Order to Objectively Evaluate the Teacher's Instructional Performance is Utilized in the Principal's Evaluation Program	135
30.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of the Personnel Involved in the Formal Observations	137
31.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Reliability of the Formal Observation of a Teacher Increases with the Number of Formal Observations of that Teacher	139

Table

Page

32.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Reliability of the Formal Observation of a Teacher Increases with the Number of Formal Observations of that Teacher	141
33.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Minimum number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff	143
34.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Maximum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff	144
35.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Minimum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff by the Principal	145
36.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Maximum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff by the Principal	146
37.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, Formal Observations are Made More Frequently on Inexperienced Teachers on the Principal's Staff	148
38.	Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Formal Observations are Made More Frequently on Inexperienced Teachers on the Principal's Staff	150
39.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Formal Observation Process will be More Reliable if More than one Person is Involved in the Observing Process	152

40. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Formal Observation Process will be More Reliable if More than One Person is Involved in the Observing Process 155
41. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Formal Observation is for the Length of the Class Period or Long Enough to Objectively Observe the Activity of the Class 157
42. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Formal Observation is for the Length of the Class Period or Long Enough to Objectively Observe the Activity of the Class 159
43. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of the Average Length of the Principal's Formal Evaluation 161
44. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff are Informed in Advance as to When a Formal Evaluation will be Taking Place 162
45. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff are Informed in Advance as to When a Formal Evaluation will be Taking Place 165
46. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principals Staff have a Meeting with Him, or One of the Persons Who will be Observing Them Prior to any Formal Observation 165
47. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Have a Meeting with Him, or One of the Observers Who will be Observing Them Prior to Any Formal Observation 168

48. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, After a Teacher has been Formally Observed, a Conference is held with the Teacher and the Observer, Where a Summarization of the Observation takes Place..... 171
49. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, After a Teacher has been Formally Observed, a Conference is held with the Teacher and the Observer, Where a Summarization of the Observation Takes Place 173
50. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, When Observing in a Formal Evaluation a Checklist of Observation Objectives are Used by the Observer 175
51. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, When Observing in a Formal Evaluation a Checklist of Observation Objectives are Used by the Observer 178
52. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in general have sufficient skill to Objectively Observe Teacher Performance 180
53. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General Have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Observe Teacher Performance 183
54. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General Have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Discuss the Observations with the Teacher 185

55. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Discuss the Observations with the Teacher 188
56. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, There is Other Formally Planned Input Used in the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program Aside From Formal Observations 190
57. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, There is Other Formally Planned Input Used in the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program Aside from Formal Observations 192
58. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding Formally Planned Input Used in the Teacher Evaluation Program Aside from Formal Observation 195
59. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In General, the Principal Needs to Devote More Time to the Process of Evaluating Teachers 197
60. Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In General, the Principal Needs to Devote More Time to the Process of Evaluating Teachers 200
61. Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of Reasons for not Spending More Time on Teacher Evaluation 202

Table

Page

62.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of the Procedures that Principals have Found to be Most Effective in Helping Teachers Correct Incompetencies	204
63.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Greatest Strength of Their Teacher Evaluation Program	205
64.	Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Greatest Weakness of Their Teacher Evaluation Program	207
65.	Summary of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the 26 Teacher Evaluation Criteria	210

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Concern has been expressed by many educators in the state of Iowa regarding teacher evaluation in the public schools. A major cause for concern has been the charge by teachers that public school administrators evaluate teachers subjectively upon criteria that are unrelated to the purpose of teacher evaluation. The purpose of teacher evaluation is generally agreed upon by educators to be "for the improvement of instruction." Flanders sums it up by saying, "In the final analysis all evaluation of teaching has the ultimate purpose of improving instruction."¹ Millard concurs by stating, "Most educators consider the improvement of instruction to be the most important purpose for evaluation."² Some teachers have charged that the evaluation of teachers was based on casual observations and the chief criterion for evaluation was organizational compliance. Other teachers have cited the failure of school administrators to make the criteria and the results of the teacher evaluation known to the teacher. Teachers have also stated the administrators

¹Ned Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 224.

²Joseph Millard, Teacher Evaluation Systems, Ankeny, Joint County School Systems, September, 1974, p. 8.

have made the results known to the teacher, but have not given the teacher suggestions for improving instruction.

There is general agreement by educators that the principal must be the instructional leader. Hansen points out the pressure on today's administrator to be the leader:

Remembering the historical development of the administrator as a leader in educational practice, the public is demanding that the administrator again return to his primary function, which is the enhancer of the learning process through the improvement of and his¹ participation in the instructional program.

There is considerable pressure in today's educational scene to make the schools more accountable for their performance. This is putting additional pressure directly on principals to evaluate their instructional program. Thus, principals are going to be forced to have an effective, thorough and fair teacher evaluation program. Teacher evaluation, it appears, is going to be a primary objective of school boards, communities and administrators. Teachers, on the other hand, are going to feel this sudden emphasis. As a result, many are going to be distrustful of the objectives and procedures of evaluation. The principal is going to be caught in the middle of the teacher evaluation pressures.

Teachers may be evaluated: "(1) According to their

¹Merrell J. Hansen, "Administration: Role and Function in Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 84.

skills and attitudes, (2) by observing their behavior, (3) by observing the student's behavior and achievement, and (4) by a combination of means."¹ This subjective and arbitrary evaluation has been charged with contributing to a "neglect of teaching and to discontentment among teachers."² Discontentment, therefore, among teachers has contributed to teacher militancy in many sections of the country. It has also led to demands for a greater role in decision making in the public schools by teachers through teachers' organizations. The teachers' organizations in many states have seriously curtailed administrators' freedom to manage the schools through laws, negotiation contracts and court actions. Teacher evaluation has become a matter for negotiations in some states, and the dismissal of incompetent teachers has become restrictive. Fred Lifton comments:

Claims of failure to adequately observe negotiated evaluation procedures and attacks based on ambiguous contract language covering evaluation have been pursued by teacher groups, both in arbitration and in the state and federal courts.³

The largest organization for teachers is the National

¹Millard, op. cit., p. 2.

²John H. Bushman, "Are Teachers Playing Statue in the Classroom," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 26.

³Fred Lifton and Wesley Wildman, Analysis of Education Associations Proposed Comprehensive Level IV Teachers Bargaining Agreement (Chicago: Illinois Association of School Boards, May, 1972), p. 29.

Educational Association (NEA). Although it is considered by many to be the least militant organization for teachers, its by-laws contain a statement on items that should be included in every negotiations agreement. The nine elements to be included in all negotiations procedures listed in the NEA Research Bulletin are:

1. Time schedule for evaluation, including the number, frequency and length of observation.
2. Designation of the evaluative criteria.
3. A statement that all observations must be with the knowledge of a teacher. Monitoring devices may not be used without consent.
4. All evaluations must be in writing on standard forms.
5. Provisions made for teachers to respond to any adverse comments.
6. A teacher may be accompanied by an organization representative when discussing evaluation reports with supervisors.
7. Grievance procedures.
8. Provisions for special assistance to teachers receiving unsatisfactory evaluations to help them improve.
9. Special provisions for the evaluations of new or probationary teachers.¹

In response to the emphasis on teacher evaluation by the NEA and the collective bargaining act, school board associations are suggesting detailed guidelines for school districts to follow regarding teacher evaluation. The

¹Beatrice Lee, ed., NEA Research Bulletin, XLVII (October, 1969), 72.

purpose of the guidelines is pointed out by Lifton in the Illinois School Board Association Document:

The general guideline is to avoid completely the negotiation of any language on teacher evaluation if at all possible. If it becomes necessary to bargain in this area, we cannot recommend too strongly that you seek competent professional advice or assistance, lest you inadvertently lose one of the most important of school board prerogatives: The right to assess and upgrade the quality of your teaching staff. It is quite clear that the board prerogative of refusing to renew the contract of a probationary teacher who does not meet your standard of excellence is under strenuous attack.¹

The school board association is taking the position that teacher evaluation is the prerogative of management. The NEA and teacher associations are making an equally strong stand that teacher evaluation has to be dictated by the teacher. The teacher's rights must be protected and the administrator must follow prescribed procedures in evaluating. Regardless of the argument to which one listens, the conclusion is the same. Teacher evaluation is going to be a top priority of administrators. If local school administrators and local boards do not have effective teacher evaluation programs, their right to evaluate their staff may be seriously diminished.

The importance of teacher evaluation is clearly established for the present and the future. Therefore, the next question to be answered is, "What criteria should be

¹Lifton and Wildman, op. cit., p. 30.

included in a teacher evaluation program?" Depending on the authority, there are many different concepts as to what teacher evaluation should be. The theory of teacher evaluation is based on the assumption that improved supervision will result in the improvement of instruction. To improve instruction, evaluation must be concerned with the instructional performance of the teacher and the outcome of that instruction. This requires that the criteria for teacher evaluation be those criterion which involve the teaching act, rather than secondary characteristics concerned only with the teacher's personality or personal appearance. Thus, the criteria for a teacher evaluation program is crucial to the success of the evaluation program.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was first to identify criteria for a teacher evaluation program. That was accomplished by surveying literature regarding teacher evaluation. From the survey, criteria were identified in regard to the essential components of a teacher evaluation program. The criteria were incorporated in a questionnaire that was sent out to high school principals in the State of Iowa. This led to the second major function of the study, the teacher evaluation practices of the high school principals. Their responses to the questions indicated the extent to which they were following the evaluation criteria. The third function of the

questionnaire was to determine the degree of importance the principals placed on the criteria, regardless of their practice. This was accomplished by having the principals rate each criterion on a six-point scale ranging from very important to very unimportant. In summary, the questionnaire listed teacher evaluation criteria and sampled the practices and attitudes of high school principals regarding the criteria.

PROCEDURE

This study attempted to determine, from the literature, agreed upon criteria regarding teacher evaluation. Many of the leading authorities in education were surveyed to determine their views regarding teacher evaluation. If three or more of the authorities agreed on a teacher evaluation criterion, it was listed in the evaluation criteria. The authorities were identified through a variety of means. They included:

1. Department of Public Instruction which gathered
 - a. PREP #21
 - b. Resumes of ERIC abstracts
 - c. Annotated bibliographies from Current Index to Journals in Education
 - d. Bibliography of resource materials
2. Bibliographies from Administration and Education classes at Drake University

3. Recommended sources from Professors at Drake University

The study also attempted to determine the evaluation practices of high school principals in Iowa, as well as their attitude toward teacher evaluation criteria.

In order to identify the high schools in the state, the Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, was contacted. From this office a list of the 1974-75 public and nonpublic high schools was obtained. The high schools then were put in rank order according to pupil enrollment, starting with the smallest enrollment and ranking to the largest enrollment. After the schools were in rank order, the sample group which was to receive the questionnaire was determined by selecting every third school on the rank order list, which was followed with the selection of every sixth school remaining on the rank order list. This resulted in a representative sample group of 228 schools. In addition, the sample had proportional representatives from the small, middle and large enrollment schools. The classification by enrollment gave a comparison of teacher evaluation practices of different sized schools.

After the questionnaire was developed, it was given to selected high school principals, not in the representative sample, to pretest the instrument for clarity of directions. Upon the completion of the pretest, the questionnaire was sent out to 228 high school principals in the state of

Iowa. The questionnaires were numbered from one to 228. The numbering was for (1) identification of those schools who did not return the questionnaire, in order that a follow-up letter and questionnaire could be sent and (2) identification and comparison of large enrollment and small enrollment schools. The enrollment classification was for grades 9-12 as follows: Class A--up to 250 students; Class AA--251-560 students; and Class AAA--over 560 students. The questionnaire was mailed back upon completion by the principals. The questionnaires were mailed on May 1, 1975. In order for the results to be valid, 176 questionnaires needed to be completed and returned.¹ On May 15, 1975, 149 questionnaires had been completed and returned. Thus, on May 16, 1975, a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to the 80 high school principals who had not responded. This resulted in the return of an additional 31 questionnaires for a total response of 180 completed questionnaires.

The data obtained presents a composite picture of the teacher evaluation practices of high school principals in the State of Iowa. The data also shows the principal's attitude toward each of the teacher evaluation criterion. In addition, the data shows a comparison of practices and attitudes of high school principals of different sized schools

¹Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Surveys in Education (Washington: Research Division of the National Education Association, 1965), Line 5, Table J.1, p. 131.

in the State of Iowa. The composite picture obtained from the data shows comparisons between the criteria promoted by the authorities and the actual practices of Iowa high school principals. The composite picture also shows comparisons between what the authorities deem important in a teacher evaluation program and what the high school principals judge to be important in a teacher evaluation program.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Criteria - Constructs or standards on which a judgment or decision may be based.

High school principal - Principal of a school that includes the following grades: (1) 10-12 when the district is organized 6-3-3; (2) 9-12 when the district is organized 5-3-4, 6-2-4 or 4-4-4; and (3) 7-12 when the district is organized 6-6.

Teacher evaluation - A process that involves the collection of objective evidence regarding the instructional performance of a member of the instructional staff, upon which judgment (subjective) is reserved until the evidence is at hand.

Formal visitation or observation - A process in which the principal, supervisory personnel, or peers visit a classroom for a period of time in order to observe objectively the classroom, the students and, most important, the teacher's instructional performance.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. The sample of high school principals is representative of the high school principals in the State of Iowa.

2. The authorities surveyed are representative of those authorities expressing opinions regarding teacher evaluation.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The study is biased by those principals, 21 percent, who did not return the questionnaire.

2. The study is limited by the accuracy of the perception of the responding secondary principals.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

IMPORTANCE OF TEACHER EVALUATION

The evaluation of teachers and teaching effectiveness is as old as the act of teaching. Reeder stated that teachers have always been compared and contrasted. If they had not been evaluated, Jesus, Socrates, Thomas, Arnold and Mark Hopkins would not have been listed among the greatest teachers of all time. Thus, teachers are continually evaluated by those with whom they come in contact. Ovard states that teachers have always been evaluated. "Students evaluate them, parents evaluate them, and principals evaluate them, formally and informally."¹ Ovard concludes that it seems that everyone in a community knows how well teachers are doing except the teachers themselves. The importance of teacher evaluation is emphasized by that statement. As Ovard points out, the teacher must know how effectively he is performing, and the teacher must be aware of his strengths and weaknesses.

There are many definitions of evaluation. In general, most agree that evaluation is deciding whether something is

¹Glen F. Ovard, "The Practitioners Guide to Research Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LIX, No. 387 (January, 1975), 87.

good or poor, favorable or unfavorable. Evaluation involves judging whether something measures up to an expected standard. In teacher evaluation, this standard is usually referred to as evaluation criterion. The Iowa State Education Association (ISEA) states that in every evaluation there must be a standard or criterion against which to judge, and there must be an idea or a description of the object, person, act, or whatever it is that would be evaluated. Partly because of the judging factor, partly because of the evaluator, and partly because of poorly defined criteria, teachers have fears regarding teacher evaluation. Klotz sums up anxiety of evaluation as follows:

History has taught us few lessons concerning evaluation, but those it has taught are significant. Any employee accepts the idea of evaluation with reluctance. This is not because he does not wish to be evaluated, but because of his uncertainty as to the criteria to be used. This lack of knowledge promotes fear and anxiety. We can learn from the past but today's schools need more reliable and more acceptable evaluation techniques.¹

The National Association of Secondary Principals (NASSP) states, "The most significant problem encountered by administrators in developing accountability programs is a fear of evaluation on the part of teaching staff members."²

¹Jack Klotz and Ken Semmann, "Supervision in Today's Labor Management," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 22.

²"Administrator's Problem - Teachers Fear Evaluation," NASSP Spotlight, XXII, No. 8 (April, 1975), 3.

The teachers have a fear of evaluation, but on the other hand they want to have constructive evaluation. If the goal of the evaluation program is to help teachers improve their instructional performance, they will welcome evaluation.

Berger states:

An astounding thing to learn is that most teachers want constructive evaluative help and expect it. Local and national teacher organizations have never taken the position that evaluation of teachers should not occur. The position has been that professionals should be doing the evaluations and that the process should be given a top priority in terms of quality and time.¹

According to the literature there seems to be little question regarding the desirability of an evaluation of teacher performance. The issues, according to Morphet, become largely one of who will do the evaluating, how it will be done, and why it will be done. When these questions are answered to the satisfaction of the teachers, the fear and anxiety associated with teacher evaluation will be lessened. It is important that all teachers know evaluation is necessary and that it will be of benefit to them. As Jacobson states, "All should recognize that some kind of evaluation is inevitable. The critical issues are the purpose of evaluation and the means by which it is made."² There is general agreement that

¹Eric Berger, "The Evaluation of Teachers," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 382 (May, 1974), 151.

²Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and Janes D. Longsdon, The Effective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963), 350.

the importance of knowing the objective of the evaluation program is crucial and cannot be over-emphasized. Indeed, the reason may be more important than the actual process. Reasons for evaluating teaching differ from school district to school district. Reasons most often given according to the Iowa State Education Association (ISEA) include:

1. To determine achievement of the objectives held by the school
2. To provide the basis for giving recognition for superior and effective service
3. To provide the basis for self improvement
4. To provide the basis for motivation
5. To provide the basis for in-service and supervisory activities
6. To provide the basis for administrative decisions
7. To provide the basis for judgments.¹

Teacher evaluation is difficult because there is no general agreement as to what constitutes effective teaching. In addition, according to the ISEA, there is not one evaluation technique that has proven to be more effective than another. Thomas comments, "There are no standards of teacher effectiveness commonly agreed upon. In addition, there is no convincing evidence that shows that one evaluation technique

¹Iowa State Education Association, "Who's a Good Teacher" (Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, 1971), Reprinted in part from report published by Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures from California School Board Association, and California Teachers Association. P. 3.

identifies good teaching."¹ Thomas also points out that there is not any reason to believe that good teaching can be segmented and evaluated by a study of certain skills or the existence of certain classroom conditions. Thus, there is general agreement in the literature that there is no way to discover the characteristics which distinguish effective and ineffective teachers unless one has made or is prepared to make a value judgment. The ISEA Bulletin points out that the effective teacher does not exist "pure and serene," available for scientific scrutiny.

This is a fiction in the minds of men. No teacher is more effective than another except as someone so decides and designates the ultimate definition of the effective teacher does not involve discovery but decree.²

Thus, there is no perfect way to evaluate other persons. Administrators and supervisors, as well as teachers, must be aware of this important point. Hall points out that the evaluator must be honest in the evaluation and make sure the evaluation is a helpful tool for both the teacher and the evaluator. With this arrangement, regardless of the perfection of the evaluation, the teacher will be given some valuable information about their classroom performance. Flanders

¹Donald Thomas, "The Principal and Teacher Evaluation," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 1.

²Ibid., p. 9.

states, "In fact, considerable improvement can be achieved if average teachers are given systematic information about their classroom behavior."¹ Flanders continues by pointing out that the scientific study of teaching is so immature at this time that a particular pattern of teaching cannot be advocated as the most successful. Barr's study concurs with Flander's statement. Barr, in an intensive three-year analysis of 39 research studies, reported the following conclusions:

1. No one appears to have developed a satisfactory working plan or system that can be used by personnel officers who must make judgments about teacher effectiveness.
2. Little has been done in evaluating the non-classroom responsibilities of the teacher. His activities as a friend and counselor of pupils, his activities as a member of a school staff, his activities as a member of the school community, and his activities as a member of the profession.
3. Very little has been done in differential measurement and prediction concern seems to have been chiefly with the general merit of teachers. Administrators often need teachers with special abilities.
4. Teaching effectiveness generally has been treated as something apart from the situation giving rise to it. More needs to be known about the situational determiners of effective teaching.²

¹Ned A. Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 229.

²Ovard, op. cit., p. 87.

It is evident in the literature that teacher evaluation is a concern of the public as well as of educators. Berger comments, "The legislature not the educational establishment is demanding that the evaluation of teachers become a top priority."¹ One example would be the California legislature, which signed into law in 1971, a "landmark" statute called the California Stull Act. It was implemented in September 1972. The law mandated that each school district establish a uniform system of evaluation and assessment of all certified personnel. The policies and procedures are specifically pointed out. Another example of concern for teacher evaluation is reflected in the collective bargaining movement. Klotz comments, "Union leadership is now saying more authoritatively than ever before that it can and wants to provide the policies that will produce bigger accomplishments and better teachers."² Klotz continues by pointing out that representatives of teacher organizations are going to the bargaining table to negotiate increased salaries, reduced class sizes, and specifications of conditions under which classrooms should be visited for job evaluation. Husacik states, "School Districts can take part of the blame for the push from collective bargaining because many school districts

¹Berger, op. cit., p. 148.

²Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 21.

had poor evaluation systems."¹ Thus, the need for well-defined evaluation systems is being demanded by the teacher organizations. Lipton sums the collective bargaining emphasis as follows:

The teacher evaluation article as found in many school collective bargaining contracts has simultaneously (1) resulted in perhaps one of the few positive achievements of collective bargaining, and (2) provided more grief to boards than most other causes combined. Collective bargaining has encouraged many districts to engage for the first time in meaningful evaluation of teachers. At the same time, however, it has been utilized (often because of the failure of evaluators to closely adhere to contract provisions) to keep incompetent teachers in the district and perhaps even place some of these personnel on tenure.²

Thus, the public and the teachers' organization have been instrumental in putting pressure on the teacher evaluation issue.

The public put pressure on legislators to have more effective teacher accountability systems. Quirk states, "The recent emphasis on accountability is becoming a popular cry by those concerned parents and taxpayers who want to ensure a

¹Ernest A. Husacik and Robert J. Wynkoop, "A Principal's Dilemma: Can Supervising be Collegial?", National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LIX, No. 387 (January, 1975), 13.

²Fred Lipton and Wesley Wildman, Analysis of Education Associations Proposed Comprehensive Level IV Teachers Bargaining Agreement (Chicago: Illinois Association of School Boards, May, 1972), p. 29.

better return on their educational investment."¹ Quirk emphasizes that parents in general feel that the schools are not removing the poor teachers. As a result, a negative feeling is generated toward the principal and the Principal's role as teacher evaluator. Berger agrees by commenting that the negative public feeling about principals is based on the public belief that incompetent teachers who are hurting students continue to teach and no one is getting rid of them. Unfortunately, as the public sees it, the purpose of evaluating teachers is to eliminate incompetent teachers. Berger states that the legislature and the public are demanding that the evaluation of teachers become a top priority. Berger continues, "It reveals what many of us long suspected, mainly that much of the public thinks principals do a poor job of evaluating teachers."² A first step in correcting this public concept would be to clearly communicate to the public that educators agree that incompetent teachers must be removed. Berger comments that boards of education and the public must be convinced that teacher evaluation will be a top priority. Above all else, according to Berger, "Educational administrators must choose to educate the public that the primary purpose of evaluation is not punitive but helpful."³ This

¹Thomas J. Quirk, "Teacher Accountability Negative and Positive," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVII, No. 377 (December, 1973), 31.

²Berger, op. cit., p. 148.

³Ibid., p. 152.

demands that educational administrators grab the leadership on the evaluation issue and explain the evaluation process to the teachers and community.

The importance of effective teacher evaluation programs is crucial to the principal. Berger states, "No issue in education today is more important for secondary school principals than evaluation of teachers."¹ Berger points out that it is critical that principals see this issue at once, with all its implications, and that principals develop modern strategies to evaluate their teachers effectively. Hansen agrees by stating:

The public is demanding that the administrator again return to his primary function which is enhancer of the learning process through the improvement of and his participation in the instructional program.²

The principal, because of his role as instructional leader, must be the force behind the evaluation movement. Weidner comments that the principal is the key to the whole evaluation process. He relates that today, more than ever in the history of the principalship, the principal has to be a teacher of teachers. Klotz summarizes the whole situation by saying, "Today teacher evaluation and supervision are in

¹Berger, op. cit., p. 147.

²Merrell J. Hansen, "Administration: Role and Function in Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 85.

a state of crisis. The crisis is not limited to any group, faction, or labor, or management sector. It exists for all."¹

Evaluation is of crucial importance to the teacher. According to Bushman, "The teacher is simply not aware of what is really happening in the classroom."² All too often, Bushman says, there is confusion between what actually happens in class and what the teacher says or thinks is happening. Even the experienced teacher remains largely unaware of much that he is doing in class. Assuming that this point is true, it would be of great benefit for a teacher to receive feedback on what is happening in his class. Barsalou states, "Most people agree that evaluation could be beneficial to teachers if done fairly and effectively."³ Thus, if the teacher trusts the motives and the major instructional objectives, it is likely the teacher will be receptive to teacher evaluation. The PREP report on teacher evaluation states:

¹Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 20.

²John H. Bushman, "Are Teachers Playing Statue in the Classroom," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 387 (December, 1974), 26.

³Judith M. Barsalou, June E. Killinger and June E. Thompson, "Student Evaluation of Staff in Secondary Schools," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 379 (February, 1974), 10.

There is some evidence that teachers welcome evaluation if (1) the major focus is on improving rather than fault finding, (2) the information produced is meaningful to the teachers, and (3) the principal takes the necessary time to collect information that is adequate and then to discuss it with the teacher.¹

Regardless of the model, the objectives, or the procedures, the key to a successful evaluation program, in part, rests with communication. Klotz comments that any new model of supervision can be effective only to the degree that its intent and purpose can be adequately communicated to and perceived by participants.

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

The role of the principal in teacher evaluation is crucial. The principal has received a great deal of criticism about teacher evaluation practices. In some school districts the principal has not given much attention to teacher evaluation. In short, many principals have apparently not made teacher evaluation a top priority. As Berger states:

One of the primary reasons incompetent teachers exist in our schools is because most educational administrators have not made teacher evaluation a top priority. Most principals do not want to evaluate teachers, and devote as little time to it as possible. Most superintendents have not demanded that evaluation be a top priority of principals. In addition, most boards of education have not demanded it of their superintendents.²

¹PREP, Paper #21: Teacher Evaluation (Washington: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972), p. 3.

²Berger, op. cit., p. 148.

Berger, in his discussion, also points out that the principal really does not see teacher evaluation as the role of the principal. In many cases the principal gets involved in paperwork and uses the paperwork as an excuse for not having time to evaluate. This excuse, according to Berger, is the excuse most often given by principals for not evaluating teachers.

Husacik points out that generally teacher supervision is regarded very narrowly by principals. He states, "The principal perceives supervision as a major ongoing function, but because of other demands, he is never quite able to devote more than 20 to 30 percent of his time to supervisory activities."¹ Thus, the principal is not spending enough time on a priority issue. Klotz states that if the principal has any awareness of staff feelings and morale, he knows that the issue of evaluation is complex. It encompasses curriculum, communication, human relations, job descriptions, morale, purposes, outcomes, personal achievement, motivation and much more. Klotz continues and states that the principal has to be aware that teacher evaluation is not accomplished in "walking through the building," or in "one easy lesson." A principal must work at being a good evaluator. In addition, the principal must be humanistic and not act as though he has all the answers about effective teaching. Administrative

¹Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 16.

style, according to Klotz, is unfortunately often authoritarian. Some administrators present themselves as single and exclusive authorities. Klotz states, "This unrealistic stance naturally must lead to great trepidation whenever principals are confronted with situations in which they hold no special expertise."¹ Klotz continues that school administrators wish to be regarded as well-liked, knowledgeable, exhibiting leadership, and contributing to the organization. Often, however, Klotz says they act or make decisions exclusively on the basis of their own judgments, without taking into account that their employees may exhibit these same qualities. Husacik agrees with this concept by stating, "Can principals convey human sensitivities in supervision rather than the all too frequent benevolent despot?"² The authoritarian attitude and humanistic qualities of the supervising administrator will be crucial to the evaluation program. In addition, the principal must not resist teacher evaluation, but instead give it priority status. PREP states that there are numerous factors involved in resistance by persons doing evaluation. They include:

1. A general lack of certainty regarding criteria, measuring process, and procedures for analysis and interpretation of data.

¹Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 22.

²Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 13.

2. A resistance to placing oneself in the position of manipulating or adversely affecting other people's lives.
3. A fear of precipitating an unpleasant reaction on the part of the person being evaluated. The reaction is then said to prevent a relationship that is conducive to helping the individual improve.
4. A lack of ability to cope with the weaknesses of the individual in terms of organizational needs and his ability to improve. This is sometimes linked with a failure to communicate to the individual the necessity of dealing with both the individual's and the organization's problems.
5. A failure to see the relationship of evaluation of others to the purposes of the person doing the evaluation.
6. An inability to organize time in such a manner that adequate observations can be made.¹

The expertise of the principal is also criticized in teacher evaluation. Husacik states, "One of the major problems of principal supervision is the impossibility of the principal being expert in all curriculum areas."² Husacik points out that the principal cannot make all the decisions. Husacik states that the principal must have other individuals participate in the supervisory process. These other individuals would go through the supervision process just like the principal. The individuals would compare their evaluations of a given teacher. Weidner agrees with this concept by stating a principal's perception of a teacher's competence

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 4.

²Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 15.

is no better than that of other individuals or groups in evaluation. Evidence shows, in fact, in many cases it is not as good, according to Weidner. Thus, in evaluating teachers, the emphasis is on making judgments in relation to objectives, instead of judging the personal worth of people. Many of the problems underlying the adverse effects of evaluation are directly traceable to poor measurement procedures. According to PREP, problems of measurement include the following:

1. Prejudice, bias or poor judgment.
2. Inconsistency of reactions to behavior.
3. Subjective ratings and classifications.
4. Influence of the personality of the teacher outside the classroom on measurement of behavior in the classroom.
5. Attempts to measure too many elements of classroom situations.
6. Tendency to continue a prior viewpoint of a person's performance.
7. Consistent over-evaluation or under-evaluation.¹

With these problems in mind, it would seem obvious that no matter who evaluates, there will be inaccuracies in their evaluation. Evaluators, as well as teachers, must be aware of these measurement problems.

Another key in the evaluation picture is the relationship that develops between the principal and the teacher in

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 43.

the evaluation process. Husacik states, "Too often evaluations do little but reinforce principal, teacher distrust."¹ He continues by commenting that today's principal must exert leadership in dealing with teachers. In evaluation, the administrator is responsible for making the teacher understand the purpose of teacher evaluation. Husacik states, "In education, administrator responsibility has too long been translated to mean keep teachers in line."² Husacik continues by pointing out that the method of "keeping the teacher in line" is becoming less and less tolerated in evaluating the instructional program. Supervision and evaluation from past administrative practices have been injurious to some teachers. As Klotz comments, "In today's educational environment, supervision has a bad reputation."³ Thus, honest and open communication must be employed to dispel the well-entrenched idea that supervision is likely to be injurious to an employee's well-being and job security. According to Klotz, teachers are threatened by evaluation simply because in the past evaluations were carried out by administrators capable of changing the teacher's employment status, rather than observing and analyzing the teacher's classroom

¹Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 13.

²Ibid., p. 13.

³Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 23.

behavior. The analyzation would be for the purpose of providing the teacher with objective feedback concerning his effectiveness in the classroom. Jacobson states that many evaluation means were unsatisfactory. "They were arbitrarily adopted and imposed upon unwilling subjects who had no voice in preparation of instruments and methods. This resulted in antipathy toward evaluation."¹

In order to avoid antipathy and distrust, the teacher must understand the purpose of evaluation. Evaluations may have quite different effects on the teachers, depending upon the purposes held by those who would evaluate. The ISEA states that a teacher is more likely to accept an evaluation conducted to see if he should receive a citation for meritorious service than he is to accept one to discover whether he is to be dismissed, even though the two processes of evaluation were the same. Thus, the purpose of a "helping relationship" contrasted with a "punitive relationship" should be promoted. The teacher must be aware that the purpose of teacher evaluation is to help him become a more effective teacher.

Observation is the technique most often used by principals in teacher evaluation. A number of authorities express concern with the observation techniques used by principals. In addition, many believe that there are not enough classroom

¹Jacobson, Reavis and Longsdon, op. cit., p. 350.

observations taking place. Berger asks some pertinent questions about observation. "How can a teacher begin to improve if he is observed only once? It should be obvious that much more of a teacher's teaching behavior needs to be seen in order to really identify his specific strengths and areas for growth."¹ Berger discusses the importance of the written evaluation of the teacher's performance being in terms of behavioral performance criteria. This criteria would point out specifics for the teacher's instructional performance. However, this is going to be very difficult if the evaluator has been in the teacher's classroom only once or twice. Berger states, "Evaluation of nontenured teachers in most schools consists of observing the teacher once in a year, writing a paragraph based on the observation, and sending a copy of this paragraph to the teacher."² Berger adds that evaluation of tenured teachers usually occurs once a decade, if that often. Davis agrees, "Many classroom teachers go through the school year without having their teaching observed either by a principal or a supervisor."³ Davis relates that some schools go through a minimum observation

¹Berger, op. cit., p. 149.

²Ibid.

³Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 63.

process, and the teacher and principal alike regard the formal evaluation only as an administrative ritual that is required. The principal and the teacher do not see any real purpose in evaluation. Morphet states, "It is important to note that rating based upon an observation or two of a teacher in a classroom is being increasingly recognized as of little value."¹ Morphet points out that observation procedures should be utilized as part of a larger plan of evaluation. Bolten comments that single observation perceptions, such as by principals, tend to be unreliable and of questionable validity. Fattu discusses findings that suggest ratings made by single person are apt to be contaminated by halo effects. Thus, the authors in general conclude that observations of a teacher's classroom must be more than one or two observations in a school year. The more observations the evaluator makes, the more reliable the information. In addition, the authors point out that more than one person should evaluate. If more than one is observing, the evaluators can compare their evaluations. PREP states, "Some teacher evaluation programs are designed for failure because not enough personnel are provided to do the job adequately."² PREP

¹Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1967), p. 426.

²PREP, op. cit., p. 68.

concludes that personnel inadequacies should be relatively easy to identify, if the principal wants to solve the problem.

In the observation process, much criticism has been aimed at the subjective nature of the evaluation. An evaluator observes and then judges. McDonald relates to this point by stating:

The current state of the art of measuring teaching behavior can only be described as dismal. The absence of testing programs to measure teaching behavior is strong. This is testimony of the lack of attention paid to quantitative descriptions of one of the most important human activities. The simple truth is that teaching behavior has not been studied in any systematic sequential and integrated fashion.¹

Thus, one of the most obvious conclusions about the measurement of teaching is that there is lack of universal agreement about what is to be measured. Ovard states, "Most of the evaluations have been based on impressions in general areas surrounding teaching. There have been few attempts to evaluate teaching effectiveness in direct relationship to learning."² With this in mind, the principal must be aware that there is not a "model" teacher evaluation program to follow. The principal will have to direct the evaluation program knowing that there is not agreement on what should be measured

¹Frederick J. McDonald, Robert W. Houston and Robert B. Howsom, "Evaluation of Teaching Behavior," Competency Based Teacher Education (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972), p. 58.

²Ovard, op. cit., p. 88.

in evaluation. However, this should not be an excuse for a principal to become frustrated and forget about teacher evaluation. Instead, it only points out that teacher evaluation measurement is extremely complicated and varies from school to school and from situation to situation.

Before a principal embarks on a teacher evaluation program, he must look at his procedures, philosophy, and constructively look at himself. The principal should look at his skills of observation, as well as his ability to communicate. Ovard comments, "The principal must become more proficient in skills of observation, evaluation, and discussion of the evaluation with members of the staff."¹ In addition, the principal's main purpose for evaluating must be evaluated, according to Ovard. Holt concludes that, "Everything that an administrator does should be for the purpose of helping kids learn. Improvement of instruction should be the principal's major goal."² Holt continues by stating that precision in evaluating teachers is impossible, but principals have to evaluate anyway. Bushman states that principals have to evaluate themselves in terms of how much time they spend in their offices. "Principals and supervisors must get out

¹Ovard, op. cit., p. 94.

²Howard B. Holt, "Everything You Need to Know About Supervision," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), 48.

of their offices and into the classroom where they belong."¹ Bushman continues by stating that principals can best improve teaching and promote the professional growth of teachers by observing instruction, and most importantly by conferring with individual members of their staffs. The improvement of teaching cannot be done by making telephone calls, dictating letters, and attending meetings. Bushman points out that the conferences between teacher and principal must be unhurried and without interruption, and concerned with teaching problems.

Instructional leadership on the part of the principal includes many tasks. The most important, according to many of the authors, is providing performance criteria for teacher growth based primarily on observations of a teacher's classes. If principals play the role of evaluator, incompetent teachers will be identified early in their first year of teaching. Berger comments, "If educational administrators refuse to say, 'quality evaluation is a top priority,' the political results will be severe and damaging to education."² This means that principals must do all they can do to help teachers improve, fire those who cannot or will not improve enough, and help all teachers to improve the quality of learning in

¹Bushman, op. cit., p. 27.

²Berger, op. cit., p. 151.

their classrooms. Administrators must adopt these instructional leadership tasks now as a major part of their role performance. Ovard states, "Regardless of the evaluation approach, principals must find evaluative rationale, evaluative criteria, and an evaluative judgment process that will stand the test of public scrutiny."¹ If principals do not follow these three objectives outlined by Ovard, accountability will be forced upon them.

CRITERIA FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

The criteria for teacher evaluation will vary from school district to school district. There is general agreement among authors that in order to have a teacher evaluation program, objectives and goals must be set by the school district. The ISEA states:

The school system which would evaluate teachers should first evaluate its objectives and state them clearly. It should then proceed to establish programs and procedures designed to achieve these goals. Then it should establish clearly, the criteria by which teachers will be judged. Finally, the school should establish the purposes for which teacher evaluation will be carried on and the procedures by which the evaluation will be affected. To leave out any step is to weaken the process of evaluation.²

Thus, the first step in the evaluation process should be the

¹Ovard, op. cit., p. 94.

²Iowa State Educational Association, op. cit., p. 8.

formulation of the educational objectives of the school system. The objectives should be translated into desired behavior changes in boys and girls, citizens and community. Teachers should be clearly aware of what the product is to be. As the ISEA states, "Criteria of effective teacher behavior should be established and they should be clearly understood by raters and teachers alike."¹ The purpose of teacher evaluation must be determined since the procedures and instruments to be used in evaluating will depend largely upon purposes. Berger concurs by stating:

The ultimate purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of instruction by encouraging the teacher through assessment of his strengths and helping the teacher grow by developing specific performance criteria for growth.²

The entire process should be a collaborative one between the evaluator and the teacher. If it is not, growth will not occur in a school and, according to Berger, administrators will be pitted against teachers and evaluation will be reduced to spying. All teachers, including the very best, need to have their performance evaluated and develop mutual performance criteria for growth. Hall agrees by stating, "Therefore, in order to assess a teacher's effectiveness, criteria must be established for that particular teacher within the

¹Iowa State Educational Association, op. cit., p. 8.

²Berger, op. cit., p. 152.

philosophy of the school."¹ Hall emphasizes that the teacher's first evaluation comes after the long-range objectives have been formulated.

There is general agreement among the authors that the most important purpose for evaluating teaching is the improvement of instruction. Flanders states, "In the final analysis all evaluation of teaching has the ultimate purpose of improving instruction."² With this purpose in mind, teacher evaluations should be considered as a means of helping teachers to discover needs for improvement and to appraise the character of the progress being made. Flanders adds that this purpose could not be achieved without the establishing of performance criteria. Berger states that performance criteria for improvement should be established at once and classroom observations should be made based on these criteria. He goes on to state, "If insufficient growth occurred, the administrator should have the documentation for firing."³ Thus, effective evaluation procedures require the development of criteria by which achievement or results may be judged. PREP states, "There must be agreement between the evaluator

¹George L. Hall, "Assessing Staff Effectiveness," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 382 (May, 1974), 156.

²Flanders, op. cit., p. 224.

³Berger, op. cit., p. 148.

and teacher on criteria, demands, purposes or goals. Where such agreement is lacking, evaluation will tend to be difficult and contradictory."¹ It is exceedingly important that the purpose of the evaluation be in harmony with the intent of the evaluation system. Millard states that the questions to be answered relate to the information the evaluator seeks, and that which the calculator is trying to evaluate. The evaluator must check to see if he is thinking in terms of objectives, targets, methods, degree of interaction, etc. Millard stresses the importance of the object of the evaluation being clear to all parties. Therefore, the teacher evaluation program should grow out of clearly stated goals of the school system and should contribute to the accomplishment of those goals. Teacher evaluation is not new, according to Ovard, "But now the principal will be doing it from a systems approach using district and school goals, as well as individual teacher objectives."² Members of the staff must be convinced that the purpose of the evaluation is for the improvement of instruction rather than a method of firing teachers.

After the purpose of objectives have been established, the teacher is requested to program toward the objective and to provide services that will attain the mutually agreed

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 8.

²Ovard, op. cit., p. 93.

objectives. The principal, according to Thomas, at this point has the responsibility to observe the teacher to see that the teacher is performing the service behavior discussed. Thomas continues, "By the end of the year, the teacher should have data to validate that the objectives have been achieved."¹ Validation data can be of various forms. It is important that validation be accurate. One problem is that some evaluators evaluate the person and not the instructional performance. The key, according to PREP is, "In evaluating teachers, the emphasis is on making judgments in relation to objectives, not on judging the personal worth of people."² Ubben concurs by pointing out that evaluation ceases to compare teachers, but instead compares "before" and "after" with agreed upon goals and objectives. These are determined jointly by the teacher and the principal. Therefore, the teacher must be accountable for knowing the instructional objectives of the school program. In addition, according to Quirk, "The teachers must develop professional standards of performance for performing according to the specifications of the programs established in the schools."³ The major focus in teacher evaluation has become the

¹Thomas, op. cit., p. 6.

²PREP, op. cit., p. 3.

³Quirk, op. cit., p. 40.

achievement of learning objectives. Cardellicchio states, "Supervision by objectives requires a shift from judging a teacher's competency by the procedures followed in the classroom to judgment in terms of the results the teacher is getting with learners."¹ Cardellicchio continues by pointing out that a guiding principle for developing evaluative criteria should be that teaching methods be assessed for congruence with the objectives outlined by the teacher in consultation with his supervisor. Cardellicchio states, "Methods cannot be evaluated without reference to the goals one desires to achieve; to do so would cause the errors which originally fostered evaluation by outcomes."² Thus, analysis of teaching methods in relation to goals can provide a useful tool for improving instruction and for evaluating teachers.

There is general agreement that involvement of teachers is crucial in developing an effective teacher evaluation program. One of the conclusions of the authors is that it is imperative that the principal and the teacher communicate. Thomas comments that a principal must meet with each teacher individually to establish what it is that the principal expects from the teacher for the school year. The principal and teacher agree on certain things to be accomplished

¹Thomas L. Cardellicchio, "Evaluating Teachers Methods," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 386 (December, 1974), p. 8.

²Ibid., p. 12.

during the school year. According to Thomas, it is imperative that the principal find time to talk with each teacher and plan the work of the school. Thomas states, "After all, success or failure of schools is largely determined by what teachers do with children in classrooms and not by what happens in the administrative offices."¹ Berger concurs by stating that it is only through dialogue, mutual give and take, that a teacher can commit himself to improving in the directions pointed out by the performance criteria as goals for his growth. Through the conferences and dialogue, procedures to be followed in teacher evaluation should be clearly established. Each person should be aware of their role and the role of every other person involved. No possibility of misunderstanding should exist. The ISEA states, "Evaluation should be conducted ethically, openly, and in good taste. There should not be any procedure or report of which the teacher is unaware."² The ISEA continues by commenting that the right of the teacher to be informed and to make use of reported strengths and weaknesses in self-evaluation should always be respected. According to the ISEA, "Through this knowledge of strengths and weaknesses a teacher can improve his work. Usually when a teacher views evaluation as a means to improve his instruction, he accepts it as

¹Thomas, op. cit., p. 5.

²Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 29.

part of the teaching assignment."¹

The importance of the involvement of the principal and the teacher is clear. It is also crucial that the teacher be actively involved in setting up teacher evaluation procedures and policies. "In particular, the teachers must be active partners with administration in the development of the teacher evaluation program,"² according to the ISEA. The partnership relationship in establishing a teacher evaluation program will establish a more workable program. The ISEA points out that in all teacher evaluation activities where policy is being made or where procedures are being developed, there should be genuine cooperative participation by those concerned to the greatest extent possible. The reasons for this, according to the ISEA, are as follows:

1. Involvement in making a decision disposes people to accept the decision and actively support the decision.
2. Working together on common problems is known to be one of the most effective means of helping people to change their behavior.
3. We are committed as a society to the processes and principles of democracy which among other things call for respect for individuals and their participation where their welfare is involved.³

The ISEA points out that it should be remembered that the purpose and use, rather than the procedure, will largely

¹Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 22.

²Ibid., p. 27.

³Ibid.

determine the reaction of teachers to teacher evaluation. As an example, rating for merit pay probably would produce quite different effects from those expected from evaluation for purposes of setting up in-service improvement programs. PREP states that:

Involving teachers, as well as other members of the educational community in the development of criteria, may help establish more accurately defined criteria and may improve the morale of the professional staff.¹

Regardless of how the goals are established, according to PREP, output and procedural goals are more likely to be understood and attained when they are cooperatively developed by the teacher and principal or supervisor, and are written in discriminating terms. The NASSP Newsletter states, "Members of the staff must be involved and informed of all aspects of the development of the accountability program."² Heller states that the popular refrain of opinion makers in education stresses that only when staff can become involved in planning and steering the course of educational efforts will success, happiness and minimum teacher apathy be possible. Heller adds, "All those affected by a decision should have a hand in making it. It is extremely important that teachers participate in the framing of the characteristics of the good

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 53.

²"Administrator's Problem - Teachers Fear Evaluation," op. cit., p. 3.

or superior teacher."¹ Heller also states that teachers must also participate in the development of a plan of evaluation. Flanders states, "Teachers will cooperate if they agree with the purpose of evaluation. They will resist if they mistrust these purposes."² Thus, the decision to cooperate rests on their perceptions. All data gathering procedures must be understood by the teacher. Ovard comments that morale can be negatively affected by teacher evaluation processes, however, morale improves with teacher involvement. "Traditional measurement is not accurate as it is too subjective."³ Ovard points out that criteria worked out by teachers is more accepted by the teacher when used in his evaluation.

Prior to the individual evaluation of a teacher, each teacher should be involved in self-evaluation, where the teacher is evaluating his own strengths and weaknesses. Flanders states, "The most effective changes in methods of instruction occur when a teacher can compare what he wanted to accomplish with a nonthreatening, objective summarization

¹M. P. Heller, "Involvement of the Involved," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, No. 387 (December, 1974), 44.

²Flanders, op. cit., p. 221.

³Ovard, op. cit., p. 88.

of his spontaneous behavior."¹ Flanders concludes that teachers can be told how to change, but changes that result in improvements are self-motivated. Thus, a supervisor who helps a teacher to discover some better method is of a real help to the teacher. Bolten comments that self-evaluation is productive only if a teacher can look at himself with some degree of objectivity. The advantage of self-evaluation seems clear. The teacher has the opportunity for improvement without external threat. PREP states, "Self-evaluation reduces the threat of outside intervention and therefore has potential for increasing motivation and creativity."² The teacher must be interested and committed to evaluating himself and his classroom performance. The classroom performance is the critical issue. As Bushman states, "To effect change then teachers must first be willing to find out what is happening in their classrooms."³

The observation technique is the most utilized technique used by supervisors in evaluating teachers. There has been much criticism regarding observations, but there is general agreement that observation techniques will have to be part of the teacher evaluation program. PREP states that

¹Flanders, op. cit., p. 224.

²PREP, op. cit., p. 77.

³Bushman, op. cit., p. 28.

the observer must know something about the context within which he is observing. PREP implies that the observer should:

1. Discuss the situation which he will observe with the teacher prior to observing.
2. Confer with the teacher following the observation to check his own understanding of the context.
3. Develop his own understanding of the¹ impact of contents on both students and teachers.

Thus, the teacher and principal will know what is expected of each other. Bushman points out that introducing teachers to observation systems and inviting them to participate will give them the impetus to improve their teaching through increased self-knowledge. Bushman states, "To become better facilitators of classroom learning, one must acquaint teachers with the use of observation systems. These systems quantify selected behaviors, thus enabling teachers to receive objective feedback."² This objective feedback will conceptualize their classroom behavior and will appraise their own teaching effectiveness in view of the objectives that they have set forth. These observation systems, according to Bushman, must be thought of as tools for the teacher to use in self-appraisal, rather than for the administrator to use in evaluation. Bushman concludes that each administrator should

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 90.

²Bushman, op. cit., p. 35.

implement a program in which interested teachers are invited to learn and to use one or more observation systems.

Holt states that it is important that the administrator visit classes for his own education as well as for assistance to teachers. An effective principal is aware of what is going on in the classrooms. Weidner points out that a principal's judgment about a teacher will be directly affected by the length and the number of observations. The more numerous the observations, in general, the more accurate the quality, validity and accuracy of that observation. The ISEA states that the raters should be trained in observational techniques and in the use of the specific instruments. Husacik points out that three factors are important in evaluating. They are:

1. The skills of the principal in making evaluative judgment.
2. The readiness of the teacher to be evaluated.
3. The instrument or criteria used in making judgments.¹

Ovard concurs by stating that the principal must become more proficient in skills of observation, evaluation and discussion of a teacher's performance. Ovard points out that the discussion of the evaluation is as important as the observation. The principal must communicate to the teacher in

¹Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 14.

objective terms.

In general, there is agreement that observations of a teacher's performance are more reliable if more than one person is observing and evaluating. Bolten comments that the quality of evaluation could be greatly enhanced by increased numbers of evaluations over a particular period of time, as well as by providing multiple inputs of a variety of people. The ISEA concurs by stating, "One person watching a teacher's performance may rate the teacher very differently from another. Adequate preparation for the task of rating tends greatly to increase the inter-rater agreement."¹ In addition, a well-defined rating instrument with clear descriptions of the characteristics and behaviors to be observed will increase agreement. The ISEA states that if more than one person does rate a teacher, the ratings should be done independently. Validity would be improved by averaging the ratings of several persons. PREP states that a number of people should be considered when developing a plan of collecting information of classroom behavior. They include: "(1) Principals, (2) vice principals, (3) department heads, (4) subject matter specialists, (5) general consultants, (6) personnel specialists, (7) peers, (8) students, (9) parents."² The observers

¹Iowa State Educational Association, op. cit., p. 22.

²PREP, op. cit., p. 88.

of teacher behavior and classroom interaction should develop means for checking their own reliability. This usually means comparing observations with another observer and the teacher being observed. PREP states that if part of the function of the evaluator is to provide assistance for teachers (i.e., to be a coach rather than an umpire), then, "Consideration should be given to the number of evaluators needed to do an adequate job, and efforts should be made to work toward acquisition of these evaluators."¹

There has been increased attention paid to the use of objective instruments in teacher evaluation. If instruments are used, there must be objectives for the instruments. The ISEA states, "Rating devices should include attention to at least the three areas of teacher competence indicated by research: (1) Relations with pupils, (2) control and management, and (3) quality of instruction."² The ISEA discusses that the criteria of effective teaching should be translated into appropriate rating instruments. The number and the kind will be dependent upon the different kinds of people who will participate. PREP states, "Instruments should not be chosen solely on the basis of the evaluator's familiarity with the instrument, its availability, or the fact that other districts

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 44.

²Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 30.

are using it."¹ Instead, ISEA points out that consideration should include: "(1) Relevance to goals, (2) acceptability by those who are involved, (3) accessibility of information, (4) time needed to acquire information, and (4) cost."²

Interaction analysis is one term often used to describe an objective method used for teacher evaluation. The method is simply a mechanical recording of the happenings of a classroom. PREP points out that there have been two major applications of classroom interaction analysis procedures: "(1) To help an individual develop and control his teaching behavior; (2) To discover how to explain the chain of events which occur in the classroom."³ Cardellichio states that by classifying the interaction in the classroom according to interaction analysis, the teacher or observer is able to identify the kind of interaction taking place in the classroom and assess its congruence with the kind of outcome he desires.

PREP states that if rating scales or checklists are used in evaluating teachers, their accuracy may be improved by, "(1) Clearly defining the focus of the evaluation; (2) Developing specific, low inference items; (3) Using a common

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 62.

²Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 30.

³PREP, op. cit., p. 63.

record form; and (4) Providing adequate training for the observers."¹ PREP continues by stating that in selecting measure for evaluation, a major rule of thumb is to select that which best fits the purpose. Thus, the evaluator must identify the measurement techniques and strategies which provide the data desired. Data acquired for teacher evaluation purposes may be analyzed and interpreted with a greater degree of confidence, if in the evaluation process the following two questions, according to PREP, can be answered positively: (1) Will the measuring instruments employed fit the purpose of the evaluation, and will they do an adequate job? (2) Have the measuring instruments been implemented accurately? Holt comments, "Instruments are not the be-all and end-all of the evaluation of learning, but they do have an important role."² With the use of instruments and recording models for classroom observations, it is acceptable to ask that teachers draw their own conclusions. However, as Berger points out, "An evaluator has to have an interpretation of the data also. The evaluator must be willing to share this with the teacher if the teacher draws different conclusions."³ Since observation techniques are the primary method used by

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 91.

²Holt, op. cit., p. 49.

³Berger, op. cit., p. 150.

principals and supervisors in conducting their teacher evaluation system, there are some guiding principles that should be examined in detail. PREP states that most information is collected by means of observation and good observation has certain prerequisites:

1. Some purpose needs to be identified. A person does not just observe; he observes for something, something specific.
2. The more specifically one identifies what he is looking for, and the more systematically he plans for observation, the more likely it is that he will know something following the observation.¹

Thus, the purpose must be identified before the evaluator walks into the classroom. Hall says that when you visit the teacher's classroom you should observe for specifics and ask the following questions:

1. Is the climate of the classroom conducive to good educational practices, one in which the child can enjoy himself and feel that he belongs?
2. Does he have good rapport with the students?
3. What types of materials are available for each student?
4. Is he a good housekeeper?
5. Does he communicate with the students on their level of understanding?
6. Does he ask enough thought-provoking questions of the students?
7. Does he have enough patience to work with students?
8. Are new and different teaching techniques tried?

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 90.

9. Are the students stimulated to think and evaluate information?¹

Regardless of the evaluator's question, there should be specifics that the evaluator is trying to objectively evaluate. Holt states that in observing a class, one must try to determine first what learning is taking place, and then determine what causes it. According to Holt, "Reversing the process will only get you into trouble."² Biddle states that ideally the investigator should gather information about overt variables through the direct observation of behavior. Biddle emphasizes that behavior in the classroom should be recorded mechanically. Berger adds that the evaluation process works best when there are more observations as opposed to one or two, and when the teacher can agree on the performance criteria as goals for his growth. In addition, Berger states, "There is a unique and distinct value of an evaluator walking in on a teacher unannounced and assessing what he sees with no personal preparation of either person."³ Whether or not the teacher knows that the evaluator is coming, there is merit to the accuracy of the observation increasing with the number of visits. Weidner suggests that a general rule of thumb is for a principal to be evaluating classroom

¹Hall, op. cit., p. 157.

²Holt, op. cit., p. 49.

³Berger, op. cit., p. 148.

teaching an hour a day. The ISEA states, "There should be adequate opportunity for observation. In most cases a moderate number of visits, involving perhaps five or six man-hours would be sufficient."¹ PREP states that in order to satisfy the evaluation purposes, each teacher should be observed in the classroom environment several times annually at different times of the day or in varying types of instruction. Such observations can be a mixture of observation procedures, according to PREP, and may be made by appointment or not. PREP states that an evaluator should:

1. Specify the amount of time per week which should be spent in teacher evaluation procedures.
2. Indicate how long each observation should be and whether the observation should be followed by a teacher conference and written record.²

The conference between teacher and principal provides the teacher with the opportunity to see if he views his teaching performance in the same way as the evaluator. The conference provides the evaluator with the opportunity to say to the teacher, according to Berger, that the evaluator has observed, collected data, drawn conclusions about the teacher's strengths and weaknesses, and now wants to share this information with the teacher. There is a growing awareness, according to Berger, that the post observation conference

¹Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 30.

²PREP, op. cit., p. 77.

is essential. Holt comments, "A visit to a classroom, however brief, should be followed by a conference with the teacher, however brief."¹ Hall believes the conference is very important because the conference is used to discuss the teacher's job performance and the implications of the evaluation. Weidner suggests a series of conferences are necessary for an effective teacher evaluation program. The conferences include:

1. Preobservation conference where you plan teacher activities to be observed, goals to be identified, problems anticipated, materials and strategy of teaching, process of learning, provision for feedback and evaluation to be identified, and how the evaluation will take place.
2. Observation itself. A conference may be held at the end of the class period, if needed. However, it would be for clarification purposes, brief and informal.
3. Post-observation conference where teacher and principal analyze events of the class, first individually and then together.²

Weidner believes that these three steps are essential to effective evaluating and open-communication. PREP concurs by stating that excellent communication between teachers and evaluators is essential in the post-observation conferences and formal reports. Every classroom observation should be followed by a discussion between the teacher and evaluator.

¹Holt, op. cit., p. 49.

²Ray Wiedner, Principal's Audio Journal (St. Paul: Cassette Services, Inc., April, 1974).

PREP continues by pointing out that the discussion should take place as soon after the observation as possible. In addition, there should be open communication regarding what will be reported to the central office. Written copies of any report should be given to the teacher. PREP states, "Especially pertinent to the open communication between administrators and teachers is the necessity to maintain open files of formal, written evaluations."¹ When teachers know what is written regarding their performance and what is reported to the board of education, anxiety and rumor are reduced. Thus, the performance appraisal interview, post-observation conference, preobservation conference, or any conference between teacher and principal is desired because it illustrates open communication. According to PREP, these conferences can involve such diverse functions as the evaluation of performance, motivation of the subordinate, warning, praising, developing, treating the subordinate as an individual, recommending future courses of action, and the differential granting or withholding of an entire system of rewards and punishments. However, if the teacher in the conference receives information that he feels to be inaccurate, the teacher should have the right to formally disagree. The ISEA states, "There should be some form of appeal procedures for teachers who feel that their ratings do them injustice.

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 94.

This process should be simple and matter-of-fact."¹

Teacher evaluation is necessary. Not only is it necessary for the improvement of the teacher and the welfare of the student, teacher evaluation is being mandated by legislation. The Stull Act is one example where the legislature acted before the school districts. Ovard relates that the act gives guidelines and specific instructions regarding evaluator-evaluated relationships. Ovard states the following instructions as examples:

1. The evaluator-evaluated relationships necessary to the evaluation system should be defined precisely. Who evaluates whom and for what purpose.
2. The specific standards of performance and concomitant assessment criteria developed for each certificated employee should be compatible with the district's goals and objectives.
3. A minimum number of observations must be made by the evaluator on the evaluated in work situations. These observations and techniques should be sufficient in quality to provide positive contributions to the process of personal evaluation. The observations should be followed by conferences during which commendations and recommendations are presented to the evaluated.²

Ovard states that several conclusions can be made about teacher evaluation. First, the principal must accept accountability for his own effectiveness, and then staff members will be held accountable for their effectiveness.

¹Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 29.

²Ovard, op. cit., p. 92.

Another conclusion is that there is a greater frequency of evaluation of principal and teacher performance under an accountability program. In addition, evaluations are written and based on goals and objectives of the school district and subject taught, rather than traditional criteria. Ovard adds that student progress in relation to specific objectives is a valid yet illusive base for evaluation, but more and more school districts are looking at student progress as part of the evaluation program. Ovard's final conclusion is that the principals who evaluate under this system feel satisfaction because the criteria gives them guidelines to evaluate.

Regardless of the evaluation program used, or the accountability criteria, there should be an evaluation of the purposes. The ISEA states, "The teacher evaluation procedures should be evaluated and revised periodically."¹ ISEA continues by pointing out the initial plan should be subject to complete review after one year. Once a smooth working plan is established, review can be less frequent. Wherever there are purposes and programs, there should be evaluation. PREP states, "An analysis of the total evaluation process should include examining the realism of the goals of the process, the effectiveness of the teaching procedures, and

¹Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 68.

the adequacy of implementing the procedures decided upon."¹ In examining these aspects, according to PREP, one should seek answers to the following questions: (1) Is the instruction improving? (2) Are teachers receiving assistance? (3) Are students learning? Regardless of the aspects, the evaluation of professionals provides information needed to judge the effectiveness of the individual teachers. Consequently, this allows for better judgments to be made about modifications in training and placement. The assessment of the evaluation process gives the information needed to make judgments about the effectiveness of that system. PREP comments that the system should see how well they (1) measure teacher effectiveness, (2) plan the process, (3) implement the system, and (4) train and supervise those who are evaluating teachers.²

There are many authors who are emphasizing that the student should have more input regarding the performance of a teacher. Ovard states, "Many writers advocate that the sole basis of judging teacher competence should be the growth of the pupils."³ Husacik states that students have been silent for too long. Perhaps it has been lack of security

¹PREP, op. cit., p. 101.

²Ibid., p. 102.

³Ovard, op. cit., p. 90.

on the part of teachers, according to Husacik, that accounts for students not being involved in the evaluation of the curriculum. Barsalou adds, "Educators seeking to design viable evaluation procedures should consider the potential value of student input and determine the relative weight it will be given in the total process."¹ Flanders believes that the most important aspect of teaching is the relationship between the teacher and the student. Regardless of the input the administrator uses in his teacher evaluation program, according to Flanders, "Student evaluation of teacher effectiveness will have to be included to make the program complete."²

The goals and purposes of a teacher evaluation program are numerous and varied, according to the school district. The most common goals of a teacher evaluation program will be emphasized. Klotz states that there can be little doubt that teacher supervision should ideally be composed of the exchange of ideas by interacting parties. Klotz states, "In today's educational environment, supervision has a bad reputation."³ Thus, open and honest communication must be employed to dispel the well-entrenched idea that supervision is

¹Barsalou et al., op. cit., p. 14.

²Flanders, op. cit., p. 229.

³Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 23.

likely to be injurious to an employee's well being and job security. Klotz states that a sound system of supervision must fulfill certain purposes. These purposes are:

1. The purpose of a teacher supervision program should be the improvement of instructional programs.
2. Two-way communications between all participants is essential to any program of supervision if growth is to occur.
3. Common understanding of each individual's job responsibilities is a must--responsibilities that are mutually developed and agreed upon.
4. Targets for each individual need to be established through open dialogue.
5. In the past, evaluation systems have relied to a large extent on subject input. Today it is extremely important that as much objective data as possible be gathered.
6. It is vital that each teacher become an active contributing participant in his program of supervision.¹

Effective learning, stated in behavioral language, will be a major element in future accountability design, according to Ovard. Ovard states, "Traditional criteria for measuring effectiveness will also continue to be used, but with attempts to define these illusive criteria in objective behavioral terms."² To avoid a too narrow look at a teacher's effectiveness, Millard suggests that a profile be developed for each teacher being evaluated. Millard states that a teacher

¹Klotz and Semmann, op. cit., p. 24.

²Ovard, op. cit., p. 93.

evaluation profile might include the following:

1. An administrative rating form developed cooperatively by the local school administration and teachers.
2. A student questionnaire concerning the teacher's effectiveness.
3. The amount of growth students experience in various areas: Subject content, self-concept, creativity, etc.
4. A self-assessment method to be used by the teacher.¹

Millard believes that a profile will give a broad base for the evaluator and teacher to effectively evaluate teaching efficiency. Jacobson states that if no improvement in teaching efficiency is being made by a teacher, or the teacher's level of performance is below the standard of the school system, salary increase should be withheld. In addition, the future of the individual in the school system should be questioned. Jacobson discusses when the evaluation of teacher efficiency should be reviewed for administrative purposes. Jacobson states that teacher efficiency should be reviewed when:

1. Teachers are being counseled with respect to their future professional growth and development.
2. Probationary teachers are reappointed or given appointments.
3. Annual salary increases are given.
4. Teachers are advanced from a lower classification to a higher classification on the salary schedule.

¹Millard, op. cit., p. 10.

5. Promotions are made.¹

McDonald states that the only time teacher efficiency should be reviewed is for, "The effect of the teacher's teaching behavior on the performance of his students."² Regardless of the purpose for evaluation, the consensus of opinion emphasizes the importance of collecting adequate information about teaching behavior. The ISEA sums it up, "It would seem to follow that evaluation will be best done when the evidence is collected as objectively as possible and when judgment is reserved until the evidence is at hand."³

There is a great deal of emphasis on the principal being more humanistic in teacher evaluation. Husacik states, "Regardless of the type of district, distrust of the principal as supervisor can be partially minimized by employing humanistic supervisory qualities."⁴ If the principal is to be effective in the improvement of the instructional program, then he must have an understanding of the teacher and the teacher's role. Most important, according to Husacik, the principal must be effective with his interpersonal relationships with teachers. Thus, according to Husacik, "The great

¹Jacobson, et al., op. cit., p. 352.

²McDonald, op. cit., p. 69.

³Iowa State Education Association, op. cit., p. 2.

⁴Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 13.

need until the ideal is achieved is for principals to work and develop their sensitivity to individuals."¹ Bushman concurs stating that teachers need to see in their principals evidence of a strong, sincere belief that teachers are good, worthwhile people, and that they have the capabilities of good teachers. Bushman relates that teachers need to see that their principal cares about what they do in the classroom. Bushman states, "Teachers need a gentle nudge, an encouragement that stresses to the teacher the importance of continual appraisal of his teaching behavior."²

Teacher evaluation is a very complicated and intricate process. There is not an easy solution that will apply to all school districts. Each school, individually, will have to review its objectives and educational philosophy. Most important, each school must involve teachers and the community in the development of the evaluation program. The critical point is that each school realizes that teacher evaluation is a priority item, and that the school will have to devote much time and effort to the issue. If the school districts do not do this, the issue of teacher evaluation will be taken away and decided by an outside force. Berger sums it up as follows:

¹Husacik and Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 13.

²Bushman, op. cit., p. 37.

If educational administrators make the right choice and grab the leadership on this evaluation issue, then they must take the message to the public. They must educate boards of education and the public that evaluation is a top priority. They must explain the evaluation process and then argue at all levels for more expenditures to do the job well. Above all else educational administrators must choose to educate the public that the primary purpose of evaluation is not punitive but helpful.¹

In the third chapter, the data obtained from the questionnaire will present a composite picture of the teacher evaluation practices of high school principals in the state of Iowa. The data also will show the principal's attitude toward each of the teacher evaluation criterion.

¹Berger, op. cit., p. 152.

Chapter 3

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The teacher evaluation criteria were obtained by surveying the literature. If three or more of the authors agreed on a teacher evaluation criterion, it was listed in the evaluation criteria, even if there were some who disagreed that the criterion was important. The authorities were identified through a variety of means, including the following:

1. Department of Public Instruction which gathered
 - a. PREP #21.
 - b. Resumes of ERIC abstracts.
 - c. Annotated bibliographies from Current Index to Journals in Education.
 - d. Bibliography of resource materials.
2. Bibliographies from Administration and Education classes at Drake University.
3. Recommended sources from Professors at Drake University.

The authorities surveyed in this study include the following:

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Amidon, Edmund | 17. Hansen, Merrell, Jr. |
| 2. Barsalou, Judith M. | 18. Heller, M. P. |
| 3. Berger, Eric | 19. Holt, Howard B. |
| 4. Biddle, Bruce J. | 20. Houston, Robert W. |
| 5. Bolten, Dale | 21. Howsom, Robert W. |
| 6. Bushman, John H. | 22. Hughes, Larry W. |
| 7. Cardellichio, Thomas L. | 23. Husacik, Ernest A. |
| 8. Davis, Hazel | 24. Iowa State Education Association |
| 9. Ellena, William J. | 25. Jacobson, Paul B. |
| 10. Fattu, N. A. | 26. Johns, Roe L. |
| 11. Flanders, Ned A. | 27. Killinger, Judith M. |
| 12. Griffith, Francis | 28. Klota, Jack |
| 13. Gump, Paul V. | 29. Lifton, Fred |
| 14. Hunter, Elizabeth | 30. McDonald, Fredrick J. |
| 15. Hall, George L. | |

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 31. Meus, Milton B. | 44. Reller, Theodore L. |
| 32. Millard, Joseph E. | 45. Saunders, Jack |
| 33. Morphet, Edgar L. | 46. Semmann, Ken |
| 34. NASSP Spotlight | 47. Smith, Othael |
| 35. NEA Research Bulletin | 48. Thomas, Donald |
| 36. Ovard, Glen F. | 49. Thompson, June E. |
| 37. Pancella, John | 50. Ubben, Gerald C. |
| 38. Perkins, Hugh V. | 51. Waimon, Morton D. |
| 39. PREP #21 | 52. Weidner, Ray |
| 40. Quirk, Thomas J. | 53. Wildman, Wesley |
| 41. Rath, James | 54. Wright, Robert E. |
| 42. Reavis, William C. | 55. Wynkoop, Robert |
| 43. Reeder, Ward G. | |

In order to identify the high schools in the state, the Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa, was contacted. From this office a list of the 1974-75 public and non-public high schools was obtained. The high schools were put in rank order according to pupil enrollment starting with the smallest enrollment and ranking to the largest enrollment. After the schools were in rank order, the sample group which was to receive the questionnaire was determined by selecting every third school on the rank order list which was followed with the selection of every sixth school remaining on the rank order list. The first school selected was selected arbitrarily. This resulted in a representative sample group of 228 schools. The sample had proportional representatives from the small, middle, and large enrollment schools. The classification by enrollment gave a comparison of teacher evaluation practices of different sized schools. The enrollment classification was for grades 9-12 as follows: Class A - up to 250 students, Class AA - 251-560 students, Class AAA - over 560 students.

After the questionnaire was developed, it was given to twelve selected high school principals, not in the representative sample, to pretest the instrument for clarity of directions. Upon completion of the pre-test the questionnaire was sent out to 228 high school principals in the state of Iowa. Two weeks after the questionnaires were sent, 149 questionnaires had been completed and returned. In order for the results to be valid 176 questionnaires needed to be completed and returned.¹ Thus, a follow-up letter was sent to the 80 high school principals that had not responded. This resulted in the return of an additional thirty-one questionnaires for a total response of 180 completed questionnaires, or a 79 percent return rate. The questionnaires were tabulated and summarized by the high school enrollment. The composite picture of the school response, enrollment, and staff assignments were as follows:

	AAA SCHOOL	AA SCHOOL	A SCHOOL
RESPONSE	39=80%	50=85%	91=76%
AVERAGE ENROLLMENT (9-12)	1049	346	155
TEACHERS ON PRINCIPAL'S STAFF	56.4	23.3	16.1
PROFESSIONALS ON PRINCIPAL'S STAFF	63.7	26.1	17.9

This information was gathered from the classification part of

¹Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Surveys in Education (Washington: Research Division of the National Education Association, 1965), Line 5, Table J.1, p. 131.

the questionnaire and gives a composite picture of the schools.

The questionnaire identified criteria that were regarded by authors to be important to a teacher evaluation program. The criteria that were included in the questionnaire include the following: (The names of the authors recommending the criterion follow the criterion)

1. The school district has a written philosophy stating district goals and or objectives. (Thomas, Klotz, Ovard, Berger, Hall, Milliard, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Ubben)
2. All members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form. (Thomas, Cardellichio, Husacik, Klotz, Holt, Ovard, Berger, Hall, ISEA, PREP, Synkoop, Semmann, Ubben)
3. The school district has a formal written description of the teacher evaluation process. (Klotz, Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann)
4. The teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program. (Flanders, Bolten, Husacik, Klotz, Bushman, Heller, Holt, Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Morphet, Johns, Reller)
5. Teacher evaluation is one of the top priorities of the school district. (Klotz, Bushman, Heller, Ovard, Berger, PREP, Semmann, Jacobson, Reavis, Longsdon, Flanders, Houston, Hawson, McDonald)
6. The teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher. (Klotz, Holt, Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann)
7. The main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction. (Houston, Hanson, McDonald, Klotz, Holt, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Morphet, Johns, Reller, Jacobson, Reavis, Longsdon, Flanders)
8. The school district has an appeal procedure established for the teacher in case the teacher disagrees with the administrative evaluation. (Klotz, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann)

9. The teachers on the principal's staff know what is written in their evaluation file. (Klotz, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann)
10. The school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers. (Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP)
11. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program. (Thomas, Klotz, Husacik, Holt, Ovvard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann)
12. The school district has a policy of constantly evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program. (Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP)
13. The outstanding teacher, as identified by the teacher evaluation program, is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation. (Ovard, ISEA, PREP, Jacobson, Reavis, Longsdon)
14. Formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teacher's instructional performance, is utilized in the principal's evaluation program. (Husacik, Cardellichio, Klotz, Holt, Ovvard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
15. The reliability of the formal observation of a teacher increases with the number of formal observations of that teacher. (Klotz, Holt, Ovvard, Berger, PREP, Semmann, Flanders, Bolten, Weidner)
16. Formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on the principal's staff. (Berger, ISEA, PREP, Flanders, Weidner)
17. The formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process. (Klotz, Bushman, Holt, Ovvard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
18. The formal observation is for the length of the class period or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class. (Bushman, Klotz, Holt, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
19. The teachers on the principal's staff are informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place. (Klotz, Holt, Hall, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Wiedner)

20. The teachers on the principal's staff have a meeting with him, or one of the persons who will be observing them, prior to any formal observation. (Thomas, Cardellichio, Husacik, Klotz, Holt, Ovard, Berger, Hall, ISEA, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Weidner)
21. After a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place. (Klotz, Holt, Ovard, Berger, Hall, ISEA, PREP, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
22. When observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of observation objectives are used by the observer. (Husacik, Klotz, Holt, Ovard, Berger, Hall, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Weidner, Ubben)
23. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance. (Cardellichio, Husacik, Holt, Hall, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
24. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher. (Cardellichio, Husacik, Klotz, Holt, Hall, PREP, Wynkoop, Semmann, Flanders, Weidner)
25. There is other formally planned input used in the principal's teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations. (Husacik, Klotz, Bushman, Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP, Fattu, Wynkoop, Semmann, Morphet, Johns, Reller, Bolten, Weidner, Barsalou, Killinger, Thompson)
26. In general the principal needs to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers. (Holt, Ovard, Berger, ISEA, PREP)

Each principal was to respond and indicate whether they were following the criterion in their teacher evaluation program. The response to each criterion was tabulated. The second response requested on the questionnaire was a degree of importance rating on the criterion. The degree of importance was on a six point scale ranging from very important to very

unimportant. For analysis, the degree of importance was classified according to the practice of the principal and/or school district.

The first teacher evaluation criterion, that the school district have a written philosophy stating district goals and/or objectives, received an 84 percent "yes" response (Table 1). The "degree of importance" resulted in 81 percent rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class A schools rated the criterion higher with 84 percent rating as either "very important" or "moderately important", while the Class AAA and AA schools had an 80 percent response in those two categories. Of those principals not following the practice, 80 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 2). The total of the "very important" rating was 85 percent of the principals who had responded "yes".

The criterion that all members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form received a 49 percent "yes" response (Table 3). The Class AAA and AA schools had a 54 percent "yes" response while the Class A schools had a 44 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" yielded 76 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools rated the criterion higher than the Class AA, or A schools. Of those

Table 1

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, This School District has a Written Philosophy Stating District Goals and/or Objectives.

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	151	84	Very Important	84	47
No	25	14	Moderately "	63	35
Uncertain	4	2	Slightly "	24	13
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	4	2
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	5	3
			Total	180	100
TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	35	90	Very Important	21	54
No	3	8	Moderately "	10	26
Uncertain	1	2	Slightly "	6	15
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100
TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	40	80	Very Important	19	38
No	8	16	Moderately "	21	42
Uncertain	2	4	Slightly "	7	14
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	6
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	--	--
			Total	50	100

Table 1 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is			Importance of		
Followed	Number	Percent	Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	76	84	Very Important	44	49
No	14	15	Moderately "	32	35
Uncertain	1	1	Slightly "	11	12
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	1
			Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	3
			Total	91	100

Table 2

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, This School District has a Written Philosophy Stating District Goals and/or Objectives

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	71	47	13	52	--	--	--	--	+3	85	15	--	--	100	
ALL	+2	54	36	7	28	2	50	--	--	+2	86	11	3	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	19	13	3	12	2	50	--	--	+1	79	13	8	--	100	
	-1	4	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	100	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		3	1	2	8	--	--	--	--							
Total		151	100	25	100	4	100									
TOTAL	+3	19	54	2	67	--	--	--	--	+3	91	9	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	10	29	--	--	--	--	--	--	+2	100	--	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	4	11	1	33	1	100	--	--	+1	66	17	17	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Total		35	100	3	100	1	100	--	--							

Table 2 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	14	35	5	63	--	--	--	--	+3	74	26	--	--	100	
AA	+2	17	43	2	25	2	100	--	--	+2	80	10	10	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	15	1	12	--	--	--	--	+1	86	14	--	--	100	
	-1	3	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	40	100	8	100	2	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	38	50	6	43	--	--	--	--	+3	86	14	--	--	100	
A	+2	27	35	5	36	--	--	--	--	+2	84	16	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	9	12	1	7	1	100	--	--	+1	82	9	9	--	100	
	-1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	1	2	2	14	--	--	--	--							
	Total	76	100	14	100	1	100	--	--							

Table 3

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, All Members of the Principal's
Teaching Staff have Their Instructional Objectives
Identified in Printed Form

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	88	49	Very Important	69	38
No	87	48	Moderately "	69	38
Uncertain	5	3	Slightly "	29	16
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	5	3
Total	180	100	Moderately "	2	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	6	4
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	21	54	Very Important	16	41
No	16	41	Moderately "	16	41
Uncertain	2	5	Slightly "	4	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	27	54	Very Important	19	38
No	22	44	Moderately "	20	40
Uncertain	1	2	Slightly "	6	12
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	4
Total	50	100	Moderately "	1	2
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	4
			Total	50	100

Table 3 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	40	44	Very Important	34	37
No	49	54	Moderately "	33	36
Uncertain	2	2	Slightly "	19	22
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	2
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	2
			Total	91	100

principals not following the criterion. Sixty-nine percent rated it either "very important" or "moderately important," while 84 percent of those responding "yes" had rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 4).

The criterion that the school district has a formal written description of the teacher evaluation process, received a 67 percent "yes" response (Table 5). The Class AAA schools had the highest "yes" response with 79 percent. The "degree of importance" resulted in 70 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA, AA, and A schools had similar responses, with Class AAA schools having a higher percent of "very important" responses. Of those not following the practice, 50 percent of the respondents rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 6). Of those following the practice 80 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important".

The criterion that the teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program, received a 72 percent "yes" response (Table 7). The Class AAA schools received an 81 percent "yes" response while the Class A schools had a 65 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 76 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA

Table 4

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, All Members of the Principal's Teaching Staff Have Their Instructional Objectives Identified in Printed Form.

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	32	37	34	39	3	60	--	--	+3	46	49	5	--	100
ALL	+2	41	47	26	30	2	40	--	--	+2	59	38	3	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	10	11	19	22	--	--	--	--	+1	34	66	--	--	100
	-1	1	1	4	5	--	--	--	--	-1	20	80	--	--	100
	-2	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	-2	50	50	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	3	3	3	3	--	--	--	--						
	Total	88	100	87	100	5	100	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	10	48	5	31	1	50	--	--	+3	63	31	6	--	100
AAA	+2	8	38	7	44	1	50	--	--	+2	50	44	6	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	1	4	3	19	--	--	--	--	+1	25	75	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	10	--	--	--	--	--	--						
	Total	21	100	16	100	2	100	--	--						

Table 4 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	7	26	11	50	1	100	--	--	+3	37	58	5	--	100
AA	+2	13	48	7	31	--	--	--	--	+2	65	35	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	5	19	1	5	--	--	--	--	+1	83	17	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	2	9	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	1	5	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
NR		2	7	--	--	--	--	--	--						
Total		27	100	22	100	1	100	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	14	36	19	39	1	50	--	--	+3	44	53	3	--	100
A	+2	20	50	12	25	1	50	--	--	+2	61	36	3	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	4	10	15	32	--	--	--	--	+1	21	79	--	--	100
	-1	1	2	1	2	--	--	--	--	-1	50	50	--	--	100
	-2	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	100	--	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
NR		--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--						
Total		40	100	49	100	2	100	--	--						

Table 5

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Formal Written Description of the Teacher Evaluation Process

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	120	67	Very Important	80	44
No	59	32	Moderately "	47	26
Uncertain	1	1	Slightly "	32	18
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	9	5
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	12	7
			Total	180	100
TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	31	79	Very Important	21	54
No	8	21	Moderately "	7	18
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	7	18
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	7
			Total	39	100
TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	33	66	Very Important	22	44
No	17	34	Moderately "	14	28
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	8	16
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	6
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	6
			Total	50	100

Table 5 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is			Importance of		
Followed	Number	Percent	Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	56	62	Very Important	37	41
No	34	37	Moderately "	26	29
Uncertain	1	1	Slightly "	17	19
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	5	5
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	6	6
			Total	91	100

Table 6

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Formal Written Description of the Teacher Evaluation Process

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	64	53	15	25	1	100	--	--	+3	80	19	1	--	100
ALL	+2	32	27	15	25	--	--	--	--	+2	68	32	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	14	12	18	31	--	--	--	--	+1	44	56	--	--	100
	-1	1	1	8	13	--	--	--	--	-1	11	89	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	9	7	3	6	--	--	--	--						
Total		120	100	59	100	1	100	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	19	61	2	25	--	--	--	--	+3	90	10	--	--	100
AAA	+2	4	13	3	38	--	--	--	--	+2	57	43	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	5	16	2	25	--	--	--	--	+1	71	29	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	1	12	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	3	10	--	--	--	--	--	--						
Total		31	100	8	100	--	--	--	--						

Table 6 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TOTAL	+3	16	49	6	35	--	--	--	--	+3	73	27	--	--	100	
AA	+2	12	36	2	12	--	--	--	--	+2	86	14	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	9	5	29	--	--	--	--	+1	38	62	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	3	18	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	6	1	6	--	--	--	--							
	Total	33	100	17	100	--	--	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	29	52	7	21	1	100	--	--	+3	78	19	3	--	100	
A	+2	16	29	10	29	--	--	--	--	+2	62	38	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	11	11	32	--	--	--	--	+1	35	65	--	--	100	
	-1	1	2	4	12	--	--	--	--	-1	20	80	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	4	6	2	6	--	--	--	--							
	Total	56	100	34	100	1	100	--	--							

Table 7

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers were Involved in the
Development of the Evaluation Program

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	93	72	Very Important	73	56
No	29	22	Moderately "	26	20
Uncertain	8	6	Slightly "	19	15
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	4	3
Total	130	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	8	6
			Total	130	100
TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	25	81	Very Important	17	55
No	1	3	Moderately "	8	25
Uncertain	5	16	Slightly "	3	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	31	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	10
			Total	31	100
TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	28	76	Very Important	25	68
No	7	19	Moderately "	7	19
Uncertain	2	5	Slightly "	4	11
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	37	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	1	2
			Total	37	100

Table 7 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	40	65	Very Important	31	50
No	21	34	Moderately "	11	18
Uncertain	1	1	Slightly "	12	20
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	4	6
Total	62	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	6
			Total	62	100

schools had an 87 percent response while the Class A schools had a 68 percent response to either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those that were not following the practice, 42 percent rated the criterion as "very important" or "moderately important" while 87 percent of those that were following the practice rated it in these two categories (Table 8).

The criterion that teacher evaluation is one of the top priorities of the school district, received a 53 percent "yes" response (Table 9). The highest "yes" response was the Class AA schools, 64 percent, and the lowest "yes" response was the Class A schools with a 44 percent response. The "degree of importance" resulted in a 72 percent response for either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools responded with an 84 percent rating of either "very important" or "moderately important", the Class AA schools had a 74 percent response and the Class A schools having a 65 percent response in these two categories. Of those schools practicing the criterion, 92 percent of the principals rated it as either "very important" or "moderately important", while those not practicing the criterion responded with 41 percent rating the criterion in these two categories (Table 10).

The criterion that the teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher, received a 79 percent "yes" response (Table 11). The Class

Table 8

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers were Involved in the Development of the Evaluation Program

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	62	67	6	21	5	64	--	--	+3	85	8	7	--	100
ALL	+2	19	20	6	21	1	12	--	--	+2	73	23	4	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	6	7	12	41	1	12	--	--	+1	32	63	5	--	100
	-1	1	1	3	10	--	--	--	--	-1	25	75	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	5	5	2	7	1	12	--	--						
	Total	93	100	29	100	8	100	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	14	56	--	--	3	60	--	--	+3	82	--	18	--	100
AAA	+2	7	28	1	100	--	--	--	--	+2	88	12	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	8	--	--	1	20	--	--	+1	67	--	33	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	8	--	--	1	20	--	--						
	Total	25	100	1	100	5	100	--	--						

Table 8 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	22	79	2	29	1	50	--	--	+3	88	8	4	--	100	
AA	+2	4	14	2	29	1	50	--	--	+2	57	29	14	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	7	2	29	--	--	--	--	+1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	--	--	1	13	--	--	--	--							
	Total	28	100	7	100	2	100									
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	26	65	4	19	1	100	--	--	+3	84	13	3	--	100	
A	+2	8	20	3	14	--	--	--	--	+2	73	27	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	5	10	48	--	--	--	--	+1	17	83	--	--	100	
	-1	1	3	3	14	--	--	--	--	-1	25	75	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	3	7	1	5	--	--	--	--							
	Total	40	100	21	100	1	100	--	--							

Table 9

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, Teacher Evaluation is One of the Top Priorities of this School District

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	95	53	Very Important	59	33
No	65	35	Moderately "	70	39
Uncertain	19	11	Slightly "	37	21
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	5	3
Total	180	100	Moderately "	2	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	7	3
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	23	59	Very Important	14	36
No	10	26	Moderately "	19	48
Uncertain	5	13	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	2	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	1	3
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	64	Very Important	18	36
No	11	22	Moderately "	19	38
Uncertain	7	14	Slightly "	11	22
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	4
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	--	--
			Total	50	100

Table 9 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	40	44	Very Important	27	30
No	44	48	Moderately "	32	35
Uncertain	7	8	Slightly "	23	26
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	3
			Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	5	5
			Total	91	100

Table 10

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Teacher Evaluation is One of the Top Priorities of This School District.

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	43	45	10	15	6	32	--	--	+3	76	14	10	--	100	
ALL	+2	45	47	17	26	8	42	--	--	+2	64	24	12	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	7	7	27	42	3	16	--	--	+1	19	73	8	--	100	
	-1	--	--	5	8	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	2	3	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	1	1	4	6	1	10	--	--							
	Total	95	100	65	100	19	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	12	52	1	10	1	20	--	--	+3	86	7	7	--	100	
AAA	+2	11	48	5	50	3	60	--	--	+2	58	26	16	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	3	30	--	--	--	--	+1	--	100	--	--	--	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	1	10	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	--	--	--	--	1	20	--	--							
	Total	23	100	10	100	5	100	--	--							

Table 10 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)						
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No					
TOTAL	+3	15	47	--	--	3	43	--	--	+3	83	--	17	--	100		
AA	+2	14	44	2	18	3	43	--	--	+2	74	10	16	--	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	3	9	7	64	1	14	--	--	+1	27	64	9	--	100		
	-1	--	--	2	18	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--		
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--		
NR		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--								
Total		32	100	11	100	7	100	--	--								
TOTAL	+3	16	40	9	20	2	29	--	--	+3	67	26	7	--	100		
A	+2	20	50	10	23	2	29	--	--	+2	63	31	6	--	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	4	10	17	39	2	29	--	--	+1	17	74	9	--	100		
	-1	--	--	3	7	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100		
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--		
NR		--	--	4	9	1	13	--	--								
Total		40	100	44	100	7	100	--	--								

Table 11

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The Teacher Evaluation Program
Assesses Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of Each
Teacher

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	142	79	Very Important	90	50
No	30	16	Moderately "	60	34
Uncertain	7	4	Slightly "	17	9
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	3	2
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	9	4
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	82	Very Important	23	59
No	6	15	Moderately "	8	21
Uncertain	1	3	Slightly "	4	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	2	5
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	39	78	Very Important	23	46
No	10	20	Moderately "	22	44
Uncertain	1	2	Slightly "	4	8
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	2
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	--	--
			Total	50	100

Table 11 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	71	78	Very Important	44	49
No	14	15	Moderately "	30	33
Uncertain	5	6	Slightly "	9	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	--	--
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	7	7
			Total	91	100

AAA schools had a slightly higher percentage response of "yes" with 82 percent, compared with 78 percent "yes" response for Class AA, and A schools. The "degree of importance" shows that 84 percent of the principals rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had the highest percentage with a 90 percent combined response of "very important" or "moderately important". Of those principals who responded "no", 64 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 12). Of those principals who responded "yes" 89 percent rated the criterion in these two categories.

The criterion that the main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction, received a total of 90 percent "yes" responses (Table 13). The Class AAA, AA, and A schools had similar responses with 90, 92 and 89 percent respectively. The "degree of importance" resulted in 90 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had the highest percent of responses in these two categories with 96 percent, and the Class A schools the lowest with an 87 percent response. Of those principals who responded "no", 67 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important", while those who responded "yes" had a 93 percent response in these two categories (Table 14).

Table 12

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teacher Evaluation Program Assesses Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of Each Teacher

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	80	56	9	31	1	14	--	--	+3	88	11	1	--	100	
ALL	+2	47	33	10	33	3	43	--	--	+2	78	17	5	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	7	5	8	27	2	29	--	--	+1	41	47	12	--	100	
	-1	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	2	2	1	3	--	--	--	--	-2	67	33	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	6	4	1	3	1	14	--	--							
	Total	142	100	30	100	7	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	20	63	3	50	--	--	--	--	+3	87	13	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	6	19	1	17	1	100	--	--	+2	76	12	12	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	6	2	33	--	--	--	--	+1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	100	--	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	32	100	6	100	1	100									

Table 12 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	21	54	2	20	--	--	--	--	+3	91	9	--	--	100	
AA	+2	16	41	5	50	1	100	--	--	+2	73	23	4	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	5	2	20	--	--	--	--	+1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	1	10	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	39	100	10	100	1	100									
TOTAL	+3	39	55	4	29	1	20	--	--	+3	89	9	2	--	100	
A	+2	25	35	4	29	1	20	--	--	+2	84	13	3	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	4	4	29	2	40	--	--	+1	33	45	22	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	4	6	1	7	1	20	--	--							
	Total	71	100	14	100	5	100	--	--							

Table 13

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The Main Goal of the Teacher
Evaluation Program is the Improvement of
Instruction

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	162	90	Very Important	134	74
No	9	5	Moderately "	29	16
Uncertain	9	5	Slightly "	6	3
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	9	5
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	35	90	Very Important	33	85
No	1	3	Moderately "	3	8
Uncertain	3	7	Slightly "	1	3
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	4
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	46	92	Very Important	38	76
No	1	2	Moderately "	10	20
Uncertain	3	6	Slightly "	1	2
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	1	2
			Total	50	100

Table 13 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	81	89	Very Important	63	69
No	7	8	Moderately "	16	18
Uncertain	3	3	Slightly "	4	4
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	1
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	6	7
			No Response	--	--
			Total	91	100

Table 14

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Main Goal of the Teacher Evaluation Program is the Improvement of Instruction

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	124	77	4	45	6	67	--	--	+3	92	3	5	--	100	
ALL	+2	26	16	2	22	1	11	--	--	+2	90	7	3	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	1	1	11	2	22	--	--	+1	50	16	34	--	100	
	-1	--	--	1	11	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	11	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		9	6	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Total		162	100	9	100	9	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	30	85	1	100	2	67	--	--	+3	91	3	6	--	100	
AAA	+2	2	6	--	--	1	33	--	--	+2	67	--	33	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	--	--	1	33	--	--	+1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Total		35	100	1	100	3	100	--	--							

Table 14 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	36	78	--	--	2	67	--	--	+3	95	--	5	--	--	100
AA	+2	9	20	1	100	--	--	--	--	+2	90	10	--	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	--	--	1	33	--	--	+1	--	--	100	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	46	100	1	100	3	100	--	--							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	58	72	3	44	2	67	--	--	+3	92	5	3	--	--	100
A	+2	15	19	1	14	--	--	--	--	+2	94	6	--	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	2	1	14	1	33	--	--	+1	50	25	25	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	1	14	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	1	14	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	6	7	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	81	100	7	100	3	100	--	--							

The criterion that the school district has an appeal procedure established for the teacher in case the teacher disagrees with the administrative evaluation received a 59 percent "yes" response (Table 15). The Class AAA schools had a 72 percent "yes" response while the Class A schools had a 51 percent response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 60 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had the highest percentage response with 72 percent, while the Class A schools had the lowest with a 50 percent response to either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those who responded "no" 34 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" while 78 percent of those who responded "yes" rated the criterion in these two categories (Table 16).

The criterion that the teachers on the principal's staff know what is written in their evaluation file received a 90 percent "yes" response (Table 17). The Class AAA schools had the highest percentage "yes" response with 96 percent and the Class A schools had the lowest "yes" response with 87 percent. The "degree of importance" rating resulted in 86 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had a 90 percent response in these two categories, while the Class A schools had the lowest percentage response in these two categories with 83 percent. Of those that responded "yes"

Table 15

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The School District has an Appeal
Procedure Established for the Teacher in Case the
Teacher Disagrees with the Administrative
Evaluation

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	106	59	Very Important	61	34
No	67	37	Moderately "	47	26
Uncertain	7	4	Slightly "	44	24
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	11	6
Total	180	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	2	1
			No Response	14	8
			Total	180	100
TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	28	72	Very Important	17	44
No	9	23	Moderately "	10	26
Uncertain	2	5	Slightly "	7	18
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	5
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	7
			Total	39	100
TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	64	Very Important	17	34
No	18	36	Moderately "	19	38
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	9	18
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	6
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	2
			No Response	1	2
			Total	50	100

Table 15 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	46	51	Very Important	27	30
No	40	44	Moderately "	18	20
Uncertain	5	5	Slightly "	28	31
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	6	7
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	10	10
			Total	91	100

Table 16

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has an Appeal Procedure Established for the Teacher in Case the Teacher Disagrees with the Administrative Evaluation

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
TOTAL	+3	49	46	11	16	1	14	--	--	+3	80	18	2	--	100	
ALL	+2	34	32	12	18	1	14	--	--	+2	72	26	2	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	15	14	25	38	4	58	--	--	+1	34	57	9	--	100	
	-1	--	--	11	16	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	2	3	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	8	8	5	7	1	14	--	--							
	Total	106	100	67	100	7	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	15	54	2	22	--	--	--	--	+3	88	12	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	9	32	1	12	--	--	--	--	+2	90	10	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	7	4	44	1	50	--	--	+1	29	57	14	--	100	
	-1	--	--	2	22	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	7	--	--	1	50	--	--							
	Total	28	100	9	100	2	100	--	--							

Table 16 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	15	47	2	10	--	--	--	--	+3	88	12	--	--	100	
AA	+2	13	41	6	33	--	--	--	--	+2	68	32	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	4	12	5	28	--	--	--	--	+1	44	56	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	3	17	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--							
	Total	32	100	18	100	--	--	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	12	26	14	35	1	20	--	--	+3	70	26	4	--	100	
A	+2	12	26	5	13	1	20	--	--	+2	67	28	5	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	9	20	16	40	3	60	--	--	+1	32	57	11	--	100	
	-1	6	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	100	--	--	--	100	
	-3	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	100	--	--	--	100	
	NR	5	11	5	12	--	--	--	--							
	Total	46	100	40	100	5	100	--	--							

Table 17

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's
Staff Know What is Written in Their Evaluation File

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	163	90	Very Important	122	68
No	13	7	Moderately "	33	18
Uncertain	3	2	Slightly "	12	7
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	11	5
			Total	180	100
TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	37	96	Very Important	29	74
No	1	2	Moderately "	5	13
Uncertain	1	2	Slightly "	3	18
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100
TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	47	94	Very Important	36	72
No	3	6	Moderately "	9	18
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	6
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	4
			Total	50	100

Table 17 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	79	87	Very Important	57	62
No	9	10	Moderately "	19	21
Uncertain	2	2	Slightly "	6	7
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	1	1
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	7	8
			Total	91	100

93 percent of the respondents rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 18). In addition, the total of the "very important" ratings was 98 percent of the principals following the practice.

The criterion that the school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers received a 63 percent "yes" response (Table 19). The Class AAA had the highest percentage "yes" response with 77 percent, and the Class A had the lowest with a 54 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 72 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools and AA schools were similar with a 75 percent and 76 percent total response respectively for either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class A schools had a response of 68 percent in these two categories. Of those responding "no" 48 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" while 88 percent of those that responded "yes" rated it in these two categories (Table 20).

The criterion that the teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program received a 59 percent "yes" response (Table 21). The Class AAA, AA, and A schools were similar with 59, 58, and 59 percent respectively. The "degree of importance" indicated 80 percent of the principals rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The

Table 18

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Know What is Written in Their Evaluation File

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	Total	
TOTAL	+3	120	74	2	15	--	--	--	--	+3	98	2	--	--	100	
ALL	+2	31	19	1	8	1	33	--	--	+2	94	3	3	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	5	3	5	39	2	67	--	--	+1	42	42	16	--	100	
	-1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	1	8	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	6	3	4	30	--	--	--	--							
	Total	163	100	13	100	3	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	29	78	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	5	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	+2	100	--	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	1	100	1	100	--	--	+1	34	33	33	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	5	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	37	100	1	100	1	100	--	--							

Table 18 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	35	75	1	33	--	--	--	--	+3	97	3	--	--	100
AA	+2	9	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	+2	100	--	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	4	1	33	--	--	--	--	+1	67	33	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	1	2	1	34	--	--	--	--						
	Total	47	100	3	100	--	--	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	56	71	1	11	--	--	--	--	+3	98	2	--	--	100
A	+2	17	22	1	11	1	50	--	--	+2	90	5	5	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	3	3	33	1	50	--	--	+1	33	50	17	--	100
	-1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
	NR	3	3	3	34	--	--	--	--						
	Total	79	100	9	100	2	100	--	--						

Table 19

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Written Dismissal Procedure for Teachers

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	113	63	Very Important	94	53
No	59	32	Moderately "	35	19
Uncertain	7	4	Slightly "	22	12
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	7	4
Total	180	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	4	2
			No Response	17	9
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	30	77	Very Important	23	60
No	7	18	Moderately "	6	15
Uncertain	2	5	Slightly "	4	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	6	15
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	34	68	Very Important	29	58
No	16	32	Moderately "	9	18
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	5	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	4
Total	50	100	Moderately "	1	2
			Very "	2	4
			No Response	2	4
			Total	50	100

Table 19 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	49	54	Very Important	42	46
No	36	40	Moderately "	20	22
Uncertain	5	5	Slightly "	13	14
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	5	6
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	2	2
			No Response	9	10
			Total	91	100

Table 20

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Written Dismissal Procedure for Teachers

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	81	72	11	19	2	29	--	--	+3	86	12	2	--	100	
ALL	+2	18	16	17	29	--	--	--	--	+2	51	49	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	5	14	24	2	29	--	--	+1	27	64	9	--	100	
	-1	--	--	7	11	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	4	2	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	8	7	5	8	3	42	--	--							
	Total	113	100	59	100	7	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	21	70	2	29	--	--	--	--	+3	91	9	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	5	17	1	14	--	--	--	--	+2	83	17	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	3	43	--	--	--	--	+1	25	75	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	3	10	1	14	2	100	--	--							
	Total	30	100	7	100	2	100	--	--							

Table 20 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)								
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes		Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes					
TOTAL	+3	27	79	2	13	--	--	--	--	+3	93	7	--	--			100		
AA	+2	5	15	4	25	--	--	--	--	+2	56	44	--	--			100		
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	4	25	--	--	--	--	+1	20	80	--	--			100		
	-1	--	--	2	13	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--			100		
	-2	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--			100		
	-3	--	--	2	13	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--			100		
	NR	1	3	1	7	--	--	--	--										
	Total	34	100	16	100	--	--	--	--										
<hr/>																			
TOTAL	+3	33	68	7	19	2	40	--	--	+3	79	17	4	--	--		100		
A	+2	8	16	12	34	--	--	--	--	+2	40	60	--	--			100		
SCHOOLS	+1	4	8	7	19	2	40	--	--	+1	31	54	15	--	--		100		
	-1	--	--	5	14	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--			100		
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--			--		
	-3	--	--	2	6	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--			100		
	NR	4	8	3	8	1	20	--	--										
	Total	49	100	36	100	5	100	--	--										

Table 21

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's
Staff Understand the Whole Process of the Teacher
Evaluation Program

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	106	59	Very Important	87	49
No	28	75	Moderately "	56	31
Uncertain	45	25	Slightly "	22	12
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	2	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	13	7
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	23	59	Very Important	20	51
No	5	13	Moderately "	12	31
Uncertain	11	28	Slightly "	4	10
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	8
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	29	58	Very Important	25	50
No	8	16	Moderately "	15	30
Uncertain	13	26	Slightly "	7	14
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	6
			Total	50	100

Table 21 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	54	59	Very Important	42	46
No	15	17	Moderately "	29	32
Uncertain	21	23	Slightly "	11	12
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	2	3
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very	--	--
			No Response	7	7
			Total	91	100

Class AAA schools had an 82 percent response in these two categories, compared with the Class A schools response of 78 percent. Of those principals responding "yes", 88 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" while those responding "no" had 68 percent rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 22).

The criterion that the school district has a policy of constantly evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program received a 44 percent "yes" response (Table 23). The Class AAA schools had the highest percentage "yes" response with 62 percent, while the Class AA had the lowest percentage "yes" response with 34 percent. Class A had a 42 percent response to "yes". The "degree of importance" resulted in 63 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" with a 72 percent response. The Class AA and A schools were similar with a 60 percent and 61 percent response respectively for either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those responding "yes", 82 percent of the principals rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" while 49 percent of those principals responding "no" rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 24).

The criterion that the outstanding teacher, as

Table 22

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Understand the Whole Process of the Teacher Evaluation Program

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree to Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	62	58	10	36	15	33	--	--	+3	71	12	17	--	100	
ALL	+2	32	30	9	32	15	33	--	--	+2	57	16	27	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	5	5	8	29	9	20	--	--	+1	23	36	41	--	100	
	-1	1	1	1	3	--	--	--	--	-1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	6	6	--	--	6	14	--	--							
	Total	106	100	28	100	45	100	--	--							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	14	61	2	40	4	36	--	--	+3	70	10	20	--	100	
AAA	+2	6	26	2	40	4	36	--	--	+2	50	16	34	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	4	1	20	2	18	--	--	+1	25	25	50	--	100	
	-1	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	9	--	--	1	10	--	--							
	Total	23	100	5	100	11	100	--	--							

Table 22 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	18	62	2	24	5	38	--	--	+3	72	8	20	--	100	
AA	+2	8	28	3	38	4	31	--	--	+2	53	20	27	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	3	38	3	23	--	--	+1	14	43	43	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	7	--	--	1	8	--	--							
	Total	29	100	8	100	13	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	30	56	6	40	6	29	--	--	+3	72	14	14	--	100	
A	+2	18	33	4	27	7	33	--	--	+2	62	14	24	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	5	4	27	4	19	--	--	+1	28	36	36	--	100	
	-1	1	2	1	6	--	--	--	--	-1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	4	--	--	4	19	--	--							
	Total	54	100	15	100	21	100	--	--							

Table 23

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The School District has a Policy of Constantly Evaluating and Updating the Teacher Evaluation Program

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	79	44	Very Important	58	32
No	84	47	Moderately "	56	31
Uncertain	16	8	Slightly "	39	22
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	9	5
Total	180	100	Moderately "	2	1
			Very "	2	1
			No Response	14	8
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	24	62	Very Important	16	41
No	11	28	Moderately "	12	31
Uncertain	4	10	Slightly "	8	21
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	7
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	17	34	Very Important	10	20
No	29	58	Moderately "	20	40
Uncertain	4	8	Slightly "	12	24
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	6
Total	50	100	Moderately "	1	2
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	8
			Total	50	100

Table 23 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	38	42	Very Important	32	35
No	44	48	Moderately "	24	26
Uncertain	8	9	Slightly "	19	21
Sometimes	--	--	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	6	7
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	2	2
			No Response	7	8
			Total	91	100

Table 24

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The School District has a Policy of Constantly Evaluating and Updating the Teacher Evaluation Program

	Degree to Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree to Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	42	53	14	17	2	13	--	--	+3	73	24	3	--	100	
ALL	+2	23	29	27	32	6	37	--	--	+2	41	48	11	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	10	13	25	30	4	25	--	--	+1	26	64	10	--	100	
	-1	1	1	8	10	--	--	--	--	-1	11	89	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	3	4	6	7	4	25	--	--							
	Total	79	100	84	100	16	100	--	--							
TOTAL	+3	12	50	4	36	--	--	--	--	+3	75	25	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	9	38	2	18	2	25	--	--	+2	75	17	8	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	4	5	46	2	50	--	--	+1	12	63	25	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	8	--	--	1	25	--	--							
	Total	24	100	11	100	4	100	--	--							

Table 24 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	5	29	4	14	1	25	--	--	+3	50	40	10	--	100
AA	+2	6	36	13	45	1	25	--	--	+2	30	65	5	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	5	29	6	21	1	25	--	--	+1	42	50	8	--	100
	-1	--	--	3	10	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	1	6	2	7	1	25	--	--						
	Total	17	100	29	100	4	100	--	--						
TOTAL	+3	25	66	6	13	1	13	--	--	+3	78	19	3	--	100
A	+2	8	21	12	27	4	50	--	--	+2	33	50	17	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	4	11	14	32	1	13	--	--	+1	21	74	5	--	100
	-1	1	2	5	12	--	--	--	--	-1	16	84	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	2	5	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
	NR	--	--	4	9	2	24	--	--						
	Total	38	100	44	100	8	100	--	--						

Table 25

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Outstanding Teacher, as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program is Recognized and/or Rewarded in Some Way Other Than a Written Evaluation

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	6	3	Very Important	20	11
No	139	77	Moderately "	24	14
Uncertain	2	1	Slightly "	71	39
Sometimes	30	17	Slightly		
No Response	3	2	Unimportant	17	9
Total	180	100	Moderately "	6	4
			Very "	15	8
			No Response	27	15
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	1	3	Very Important	4	10
No	34	87	Moderately "	5	13
Uncertain	1	3	Slightly "	14	36
Sometimes	3	7	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	1	3
			Very "	5	13
			No Response	9	22
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	3	6	Very Important	5	10
No	36	72	Moderately "	10	20
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	18	36
Sometimes	10	20	Slightly		
No Response	1	2	Unimportant	8	16
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	3	6
			No Response	6	12
			Total	50	100

Table 25 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	2	2	Very Important	11	12
No	69	76	Moderately "	9	10
Uncertain	1	1	Slightly "	39	43
Sometimes	17	19	Slightly		
No Response	2	2	Unimportant	8	9
Total	91	100	Moderately "	5	5
			Very "	7	8
			No Response	12	13
			Total	91	100

Table 26

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Outstanding Teacher, as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program, is Recognized and/or Rewarded in Some Way Other Than a Written Evaluation

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)						
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%					
TOTAL	+3	3	50	9	6	--	--	8	27	+3	15	45	--	40	100		
ALL	+2	3	50	11	7	--	--	10	33	+2	13	46	--	41	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	62	45	--	--	9	30	+1	--	87	--	13	100		
	-1	--	--	16	12	--	--	1	3	-1	--	94	--	6	100		
	-2	--	--	5	4	1	50	--	--	-2	--	83	17	--	100		
	-3	--	--	15	11	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100		
	NR	--	--	21	15	1	50	2	7								
	Total	6	100	139	100	2	100	30	100								
TOTAL	+3	--	--	2	6	--	--	2	27	+3	--	50	--	50	100		
AAA	+2	1	100	4	12	--	--	--	--	+2	20	80	--	--	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	13	38	--	--	1	33	+1	--	93	--	7	100		
	-1	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100		
	-3	--	--	5	15	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100		
	NR	--	--	8	23	1	100	--	--								
	Total	1	100	34	100	1	100	3	100								

Table 26 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)						
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%					
TOTAL	+3	1	33	2	6	--	--	2	20	+3	20	40	--	40	100		
AA	+2	2	67	5	14	--	--	3	30	+2	20	50	--	30	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	14	39	--	--	4	40	+1	--	78	--	22	100		
	-1	--	--	8	22	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--		
	-3	--	--	3	8	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100		
	NR	--	--	4	11	--	--	1	10								
	Total	3	100	36	100	--	--	10	100								
TOTAL	+3	2	100	5	7	--	--	4	24	+3	18	46	--	36	100		
A	+2	--	--	2	3	--	--	7	40	+2	--	22	--	78	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	35	51	--	--	4	24	+1	--	90	--	10	100		
	-1	--	--	7	10	--	--	1	6	-1	--	88	--	12	100		
	-2	--	--	4	6	1	100	--	--	-2	--	80	20	--	100		
	-3	--	--	7	10	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100		
	NR	--	--	9	13	--	--	1	6								
	Total	1	100	69	100	1	100	17	100								

identified by the teacher evaluation program, is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation received a 3 percent "yes" response (Table 25). The Class AA schools had a 6 percent "yes" response, and the Class AAA and A schools 3 percent and 2 percent "yes" response respectively. The "degree of importance" resulted in a 25 percent response as either "very important" or "moderately important", and a 39 percent response of "slightly important". The Class AA schools rated the criterion as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant" with a 52 percent response, as did the Class A schools. Of those principals responding "no" 13 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" while 57 percent rated it as "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". Those Class AA and A principals responding "no" had 61 percent rating the criterion as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant" (Table 26).

Those respondents who responded with a "yes" or "sometimes" regarding rewards to outstanding teachers, indicated the types of rewards or recognitions given (Table 27). Commendation either with the school board or administrative was utilized the most frequently. Community acknowledgement and money were next in importance. As indicated by Table 25, 77 percent of the principals did not follow the practice of rewarding the outstanding teacher.

Table 27

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding Rewards to the Outstanding Teacher as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program

Rewards	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Money	14	2	5	7
Board Commendation	16	2	6	8
Community Acknowledgement	16	4	4	8
Other Promotion	4		2	1
Administrative Commendation	4			4

The criterion that the formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teacher's instructional performance is utilized in the principal's evaluation program received an 89 percent "yes" response (Table 28). The Class AAA, AA, and A schools had similar responses with a 90, 90, and 89 percent respectively. The "degree of importance" resulted in 77 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had an 85 percent response in these two categories, while the Class A and AA schools had a 76 percent and 74 percent response respectively in these two categories. Of those that responded "yes", 80 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important", and 60 percent of those that

Table 28

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, Formal Observations, Involving Classroom Visitations in Order to Objectively Evaluate the Teacher's Instructional Performance is Utilized in the Principal's Evaluation Program

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	161	89	Very Important	90	50
No	3	2	Moderately "	49	27
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	22	13
Sometimes	15	8	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	4	2
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	15	8
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	35	90	Very Important	21	54
No	--	--	Moderately "	12	31
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	2	5
Sometimes	4	10	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	10
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	45	90	Very Important	27	54
No	--	--	Moderately "	10	20
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	10	20
Sometimes	5	10	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	2
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	14
			Total	50	100

Table 28 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	81	89	Very Important	42	46
No	3	3	Moderately "	27	30
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	10	11
Sometimes	6	7	Slightly		
No Response	1	1	Unimportant	3	3
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	9	10
			Total	91	100

Table 29

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Formal Observations, Involving Classroom Visitations in Order to Objectively Evaluate the Teacher's Instructional Performance is Utilized in the Principal's Evaluation Program

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	86	53	--	--	--	--	4	27	+3	96	--	--	4	100	
ALL	+2	43	27	1	33	--	--	5	33	+2	88	2	--	10	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	18	11	1	33	--	--	3	20	+1	82	5	--	13	100	
	-1	4	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	10	6	1	34	--	--	3	20							
	Total	161	100	3	100	--	--	15	100							
TOTAL	+3	21	60	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	10	28	--	--	--	--	2	50	+2	83	--	--	17	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	+1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	6	--	--	--	--	2	50							
	Total	35	100	--	--	--	--	4	100							

Table 29 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	27	60	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
AA	+2	2	18	--	--	--	--	2	40	+2	80	--	--	20	100
SCHOOLS	+1	7	16	--	--	--	--	3	60	+1	70	--	--	30	100
	-1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	4	--	--	--	--	--	--						
	Total	45	100	--	--	--	--	5	100						
TOTAL	+3	38	47	--	--	--	--	4	66	+3	91	--	--	9	100
A	+2	25	31	1	33	--	--	1	17	+2	92	4	--	4	100
SCHOOLS	+1	9	11	1	33	--	--	--	--	+1	90	10	--	--	100
	-1	3	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	6	7	1	34	--	--	1	17						
	Total	81	100	3	100	--	--	6	100						

responded "sometimes" rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 29)

Those schools that utilized an observation system were asked to indicate the people that were involved in the formal observations. There were two schools that did not utilize an observation system as part of their evaluation system. Of the schools that were using formal observation as part of their evaluation program, 99 percent indicated that the principal was involved in the evaluation process. As indicated by Table 30, the assistant principal is utilized more in the AAA schools and the superintendent is utilized more in the Class A schools.

Table 30

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the question of the personnel Involved in the Formal Observations

Personnel	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Principal	176	39	50	87
Assistant Principal	38	31	6	1
Superintendent	38	4	8	26
Department Chairmen	25	16	2	7
Teachers	10	1	1	8
Curriculum Specialists	7	7		
Other				
Students	2		1	1
Counselor	2			2
Board Members	1		1	
Education Committee	1		1	
Assistant Superintendent	1	1		
Consultants	1	1		
In-Service	1			1

The criterion that the reliability of the formal observation of a teacher increases with the number of formal observations of that teacher received a 59 percent response of "yes", and a 27 percent "sometimes" response (Table 31). The "yes" response of the Class AAA, AA, and A schools was 59 percent, 52 percent, and 62 percent respectively. The "sometimes" response was similar with the Class AAA and A schools with 28 percent and 20 percent respectively. The Class AA schools had a 40 percent "sometimes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 57 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools had a 59 percent response to these two categories, while the Class AA schools had the lowest percentage response with 54 percent in these categories. Of those principals that responded "yes" 84 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 32).

Tables 33, 34, 35, and 36 refer to data asked of the principals regarding their formal evaluation frequency. In Table 33, the minimum number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on the principal's staff is reported. The average minimum number of evaluations per school year for all the schools was two. The Class AAA and A schools came out the same with 2.2, and the Class AA school was the lowest with an average of 1.6 minimum formal evaluations conducted on each teacher on the principal's staff. There were 20 percent

Table 31

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Reliability of the Formal Observation of a Teacher Increases with the Number of Formal Observations of that Teacher

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	106	59	Very Important	44	24
No	10	6	Moderately "	59	33
Uncertain	9	5	Slightly "	43	24
Sometimes	49	27	Slightly		
No Response	6	3	Unimportant	8	4
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	25	14
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	23	59	Very Important	12	31
No	2	5	Moderately "	11	28
Uncertain	3	8	Slightly "	12	31
Sometimes	11	28	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	7
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	26	52	Very Important	11	22
No	1	2	Moderately "	16	32
Uncertain	2	4	Slightly "	15	30
Sometimes	20	40	Slightly		
No Response	1	2	Unimportant	1	2
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	7	14
			Total	50	100

Table 31 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	57	63	Very Important	21	23
No	7	8	Moderately "	32	35
Uncertain	4	4	Slightly "	16	18
Sometimes	18	20	Slightly		
No Response	5	5	Unimportant	6	7
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	15	16
			Total	91	100

Table 32

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Reliability of the Formal Observation of a Teacher Increases with the Number of Formal Observations of That Teacher

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	44	42	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
ALL	+2	45	42	--	--	1	11	13	27	+2	76	--	2	22	100
SCHOOLS	+1	8	8	4	40	4	45	27	55	+1	19	9	9	63	100
	-1	1	1	6	60	1	11	--	--	-1	13	74	13	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	7	6	--	--	3	33	9	18						
	Total	106	100	10	100	9	100	49	100						
TOTAL	+3	12	52	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
AAA	+2	9	39	--	--	--	--	2	18	+2	82	--	--	18	100
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	2	100	2	67	8	73	+1	--	17	17	66	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	1	33	--	--	-1	--	--	100	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	9	--	--	--	--	1	9						
	Total	23	100	2	100	3	100	11	100						

Table 32 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)								
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes		Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes					
TOTAL	+3	11	42	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	--	100			
AA	+2	8	32	--	--	1	50	7	35	+2	50	--	6	44	--	100			
SCHOOLS	+1	3	12	--	--	1	50	11	55	+1	20	--	7	73	--	100			
	-1	--	--	1	100	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	--	100			
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--			
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--			
	NR	4	15	--	--	--	--	2	10										
	Total	26	100	1	100	2	100	20	100										
<hr/>																			
TOTAL	+3	21	37	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	--	100			
A	+2	28	48	--	--	--	--	4	22	+2	88	--	--	12	--	100			
SCHOOLS	+1	5	9	2	29	1	25	8	45	+1	31	13	6	50	--	100			
	-1	1	2	5	71	--	--	--	--	-1	17	83	--	--	--	100			
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	33	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--			
	-3	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--			
	NR	1	2	--	--	3	75	--	--										
	Total	57	100	7	100	4	100	18	100										

of the principals that marked minimum.

Table 33

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Minimum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff

Number of Evaluations	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	46	26	10	26	21	42	15	17
Two	45	25	10	26	12	24	23	25
Three	19	11	4	11	1	2	14	15
Four	8	3	1	1	2	4	5	6
Five	3	2	3	8				
Six	1	1					1	1
Minimum	36	20	7	18	7	14	22	24
No Response	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	180	100	39	100	50	100	91	100
Average Number	2.0		2.2		1.6		2.2	

Table 34, refers to the maximum number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on the principal's staff. The average maximum number for all of the schools was 4.8 evaluations for each teacher. Class AAA had the highest average with 5.4 evaluations, and Class AA had the lowest with 4.4 evaluations. Class A had 4.8 formal evaluations conducted on

teachers on the principal's staff. There were 45 percent of the principals who did not respond. This compares to 12 percent who did not respond to the minimum number of formal evaluations.

Table 34

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Maximum number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff

Number of Evaluations	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Two	6	3	1	3	2	4	3	3
Three	18	10	4	10	8	16	6	7
Four	23	13	1	3	5	10	17	19
Five	14	8	4	10	3	6	7	8
Six	12	7	4	10	3	6	5	6
Seven	4	2	1	3	2	4	1	1
Eight	5	3	3	8			2	2
Nine	1	1					1	1
Ten	4	2	1	3	1	2	2	2
Maximum	12	6	6	15	3	6	3	3
No Response	<u>31</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>48</u>
Total	180	100	39	100	50	100	91	100
Average Number	4.8		5.4		4.4		4.8	

Table 35, refers to the minimum number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on the principal's staff by the principal. The average was 1.9 minimum evaluations on each teacher for all the schools. The Class A schools had the highest number with 2.2 evaluations, and Class AA had the lowest with 1.6 evaluations. Class AAA had 1.8 formal evaluations on each teacher. There were 13 percent of the principals that did not respond.

Table 35

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Minimum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff by the Principal

Number of Evaluations	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	46	26	12	31	20	40	14	15
Two	43	24	6	15	12	24	25	27
Three	24	13	6	15	2	4	16	18
Four	7	4	1	3	2	4	4	4
Minimum	36	20	7	18	7	14	22	25
No Response	<u>24</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	180	100	39	100	50	100	91	100
Average Number	1.9		1.8		1.6		2.2	

Table 36 refers to the maximum number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on the principal's staff by the principal. The average was 4.3 maximum evaluations on each teacher for all the schools. The Class AAA had the lowest average with 3.9 evaluations, while the Class AA and A schools had a 4.4 average of evaluations on each teacher. There were 42 percent of the principals that did not respond to the maximum number of evaluations conducted by the principal.

Table 36

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question Regarding the Maximum Number of Formal Evaluations Conducted on Teachers on the Principal's Staff by the Principal

Number of Evaluations	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	1	1	1	3				
Two	12	7	2	5	4	8	6	7
Three	23	13	5	13	7	14	11	12
Four	21	12	3	8	5	10	13	14
Five	12	7	2	5	3	6	7	8
Six	9	5	4	10	2	4	3	4
Seven	3	2			2	4	1	1
Eight	2	1					2	2
Nine	2	1			1	2	1	1
Ten	3	2			1	2	2	2
Maximum	14	7	6	15	4	8	4	4
No Response	<u>78</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>45</u>
Total	180	100	39	100	50	100	91	100
Average Number	4.3		3.9		4.4		4.4	

The criterion that formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on the principal's staff received an 88 percent "yes" response (Table 37). Class AA had the highest percentage "yes" response with 94 percent, and Class A had the lowest with an 84 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 83 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". Class AAA, AA, and A schools were similar in their "yes" responses with 85 percent, 84 percent, and 82 percent, respectively. Of those who responded "yes", 89 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 38). The total of the "very important" ratings was made up by 99 percent of the principals who had responded "yes".

The criterion that the formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process received a 76 percent "yes" response (Table 39). The Class AAA schools had an 85 percent "yes" response compared to the Class A "yes" response of 73 percent. There were 18 percent of the principals that responded "sometimes". The "degree of importance" resulted in 64 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". Class AAA had the highest percentage response in these two categories with 74 percent, while the Class A schools had the lowest response with 60 percent in these two categories. Of those principals

Table 37

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, Formal Observations are Made More
Frequently on Inexperienced Teachers on the
Principal's Staff

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	159	88	Very Important	101	56
No	9	6	Moderately "	48	27
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	12	6
Sometimes	8	4	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	17	9
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	36	92	Very Important	23	59
No	2	5	Moderately "	10	26
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	2	5
Sometimes	1	3	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	10
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	47	94	Very Important	31	62
No	2	4	Moderately "	11	22
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	6
Sometimes	1	2	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	2
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	8
			Total	50	100

Table 37 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	76	84	Very Important	47	52
No	5	5	Moderately "	27	30
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	7	8
Sometimes	6	7	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	--	--
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	8	9
			Total	91	100

Table 38

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, Formal Observations are Made More Frequently on Inexperienced Teachers on the Principal's Staff

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	100	63	1	11	--	--	--	--	+3	99	1	--	--	100	
ALL	+2	41	26	1	11	--	--	6	75	+2	85	2	--	13	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	7	4	3	33	--	--	2	25	+1	58	25	--	17	100	
	-1	--	--	1	11	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	1	11	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	11	7	2	23	--	--	--	--							
	Total	159	100	9	100	--	--	8	100							
TOTAL	+3	23	64	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	8	22	1	50	--	--	1	100	+2	80	10	--	10	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	1	50	--	--	--	--	+1	50	50	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	4	11	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	36	100	2	100	--	--	1	100							

Table 38 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	31	67	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
AA	+2	10	21	--	--	--	--	1	100	+2	91	--	--	9	100
SCHOOLS	+1	3	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	+1	100	--	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	1	50	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	3	6	1	50	--	--	--	--						
	Total	47	100	2	100	--	--	1	100						
TOTAL	+3	46	61	1	20	--	--	--	--	+3	98	2	--	--	100
A	+2	23	30	--	--	--	--	4	67	+2	85	--	--	15	100
SCHOOLS	+1	3	4	2	40	--	--	2	33	+1	42	29	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	1	20	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	4	5	1	20	--	--	--	--						
	Total	76	100	5	100	--	--	6	100						

Table 39

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, the Formal Observation Process will be More Reliable if More Than one Person is Involved in the Observing Process

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	137	76	Very Important	50	28
No	6	3	Moderately "	64	36
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	39	21
Sometimes	32	18	Slightly		
No Response	5	3	Unimportant	5	3
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	21	11
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	33	85	Very Important	14	36
No	1	3	Moderately "	15	38
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	5	12	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	6	5
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	38	76	Very Important	8	16
No	--	--	Moderately "	23	46
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	14	28
Sometimes	12	24	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	4
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	6
			Total	50	100

Table 39 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	66	73	Very Important	28	31
No	5	5	Moderately "	26	29
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	22	24
Sometimes	15	17	Slightly		
No Response	5	5	Unimportant	2	2
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	12	13
			Total	91	100

responding "yes", 78 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 40). Of those responding "sometimes" 53 percent rated the criterion as "slightly important".

The criterion that the formal observation is for the length of the class period or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class resulted in an 87 percent "yes" response (Table 41). Class AA and A schools had an 88 percent "yes" response, while the Class AAA schools had an 82 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 77 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". Class AAA schools had the highest percentage response with 79 percent in these two categories while the Class AA schools had the lowest with a 74 percent response to either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those responding "yes", 82 percent of the principals rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 42). The total "very important" ratings was composed of 99 percent of principals practicing the criterion.

Table 43 refers to the average length of the principal's formal evaluation. The average length of all the schools resulted in a length of 36.9 minutes. The Class AA schools had the longest observation time with an average of 39.5 minutes, while the Class A schools had an average of 35.1 minutes. The Class AAA schools averaged 36.6 minutes.

Table 40

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Formal Observation Process will be more Reliable if More than one Person is Involved in the Observing Process

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
TOTAL	+3	49	36	1	17	--	--	--	--	+3	98	2	--	--	100	
ALL	+2	57	42	1	17	--	--	6	19	+2	89	2	--	9	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	22	16	--	--	--	--	17	53	+1	56	--	--	44	100	
	-1	--	--	2	32	--	--	3	9	-1	--	40	--	60	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	1	17	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	9	6	1	17	--	--	6	19							
	Total	137	100	6	100	--	--	32	100							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	14	42	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	13	40	--	--	--	--	2	40	+2	87	--	--	13	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	6	--	--	--	--	1	20	+1	67	--	--	33	100	
	-1	--	--	1	100	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	4	12	--	--	--	--	2	40							
	Total	33	100	1	100	--	--	5	100							

Table 40 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	8	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AA	+2	22	58	--	--	--	--	1	8	+2	96	--	--	4	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	16	--	--	--	--	8	67	+1	43	--	--	57	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	17	-1	--	--	--	100	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	5	--	--	--	--	1	8							
	Total	38	100	--	--	--	--	12	100							
TOTAL	+3	27	41	1	20	--	--	--	--	+3	96	4	--	--	100	
A	+2	22	33	1	20	--	--	3	20	+2	85	4	--	11	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	14	21	--	--	--	--	8	53	+1	64	--	--	36	100	
	-1	--	--	1	20	--	--	1	7	-1	--	50	--	50	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	1	20	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	3	5	1	20	--	--	3	20							
	Total	66	100	5	100	--	--	25	100							

Table 41

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Formal Observation is for the Length of the Class Period or Long Enough to Objectively Observe the Activity of the Class

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	156	87	Very Important	74	41
No	2	1	Moderately "	64	36
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	27	15
Sometimes	19	11	Slightly		
No Response	3	1	Unimportant	--	--
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	15	8
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	82	Very Important	16	41
No	--	--	Moderately "	15	38
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	7	18	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	5	13
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	44	88	Very Important	22	44
No	--	--	Moderately "	15	30
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	11	22
Sometimes	6	12	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	4
			Total	50	100

Table 41 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	80	88	Very Important	36	40
No	2	2	Moderately "	34	37
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	13	14
Sometimes	6	7	Slightly		
No Response	3	3	Unimportant	--	--
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very	--	--
			No Response	8	9
			Total	91	100

Table 42

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Formal Observation is for the Length of the Class Period or Long Enough to Objectively Observe the Activity of the Class

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	73	47	--	--	--	--	1	5	+3	99	--	--	1	100	
ALL	+2	54	35	1	50	--	--	9	47	+2	82	4	--	14	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	19	12	1	50	--	--	7	37	+1	70	4	--	26	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	10	6	--	--	--	--	2	11							
	Total	156	100	2	100	--	--	19	100							
TOTAL	+3	16	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	11	34	--	--	--	--	4	57	+2	73	--	--	27	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	43	+1	--	--	--	100	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	5	16	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	32	100	--	--	--	--	7	100							

Table 42 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	22	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AA	+2	13	30	--	--	--	--	2	33	+2	87	--	--	13	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	8	18	--	--	--	--	3	50	+1	73	--	--	27	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		1	2	--	--	--	--	1	17							
Total		44	100	--	--	--	--	6	100							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	35	44	--	--	--	--	1	16	+3	97	--	--	3	100	
A	+2	30	38	1	50	--	--	3	50	+2	88	3	--	9	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	11	14	1	50	--	--	1	16	+1	84	8	--	8	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		4	4	--	--	--	--	1	17							
Total		80	100	2	100	--	--	6	100							

There were 3 percent of the principals that did not respond.

Table 43

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of the Average Length of the Principal's Formal Evaluation

Length of Observation	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
10 Minutes	4	2					4	4
15 Minutes	2	1			1	2	1	1
20 Minutes	18	10	5	13	5	10	8	9
25 Minutes	11	6	4	10	2	4	5	6
30 Minutes	47	26	9	23	9	18	29	32
35 Minutes	1	1			1	2		
40 Minutes	35	19	8	21	14	28	13	15
45 Minutes	16	9	3	8	3	6	10	11
50 Minutes	25	13	6	15	8	16	11	12
55 Minutes	13	7	3	8	6	12	4	4
60 Minutes	1	1					1	1
80 Minutes	1	1			1	2		
90 Minutes	1	1					1	1
No Response	5	3	1	2			4	4
Total	180	100	39	100	50	100	91	100
Average Length	36.9 Min.		36.6 Min.		39.5 Min.		35.1 Min.	

The criterion that the teachers on the principal's staff be informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place resulted in a 29 percent "yes" response and a 47 percent "sometimes" response (Table 44). The Class

Table 44

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff are Informed in Advance as to When a Formal Evaluation Will be Taking Place

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	52	29	Very Important	32	18
No	40	22	Moderately "	48	27
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	62	34
Sometimes	84	47	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	14	8
Total	180	100	Moderately "	3	2
			Very "	6	3
			No Response	15	8
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	10	26	Very Important	2	5
No	8	21	Moderately "	14	36
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	15	38
Sometimes	21	53	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	1	3
Total	39	100	Moderately "	2	5
			Very "	2	5
			No Response	3	8
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	12	24	Very Important	9	18
No	19	38	Moderately "	15	30
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	15	30
Sometimes	19	38	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	7	14
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	2	4
			No Response	2	4
			Total	50	100

Table 44 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	30	33	Very Important	21	23
No	13	14	Moderately "	19	21
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	32	35
Sometimes	44	49	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	6	7
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	2	2
			No Response	10	11
			Total	91	100

AA schools had the lowest "sometimes" percentage response with 38 percent, while Class A and Class AA had a response of 49 percent and 53 percent respectively. Class A had the highest "yes" percentage response with 33 percent and Class AA and AAA had 24 percent and 26 percent respectively. The "degree of importance" resulted in 45 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". In addition, 34 percent of the principals rated the criterion as "slightly important". The Class AA schools had the highest percentage response of either "very important" or "moderately important" with 48 percent, while the Class AAA schools had the lowest with a 41 percent response in these two categories. The Class AAA schools had the highest percentage of "slightly important" ratings with a 38 percent response. Of those that responded "sometimes", 45 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 45). Of those that responded "yes" 44 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important", and 33 percent rated it as "slightly important".

The criterion stating that the teachers on the principal's staff go through the process of having a meeting with the principal, or one of the persons who will be observing them prior to any formal observation received an 18 percent "yes" response and a 57 percent "no" response (Table 46). In addition 22 percent of the principals responded with "sometimes".

Table 45

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff are Informed in Advance as to When a Formal Evaluation will be Taking Place

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	17	33	4	10	--	--	11	13	+3	53	13	--	34	100
ALL	+2	16	31	6	15	--	--	26	32	+2	33	13	--	54	100
SCHOOLS	+1	17	33	11	28	--	--	34	40	+1	27	18	--	55	100
	-1	--	--	9	33	--	--	5	6	-1	--	64	--	36	100
	-2	--	--	3	8	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	4	10	--	--	2	2	-3	--	67	--	33	100
	NR	2	3	3	6	--	--	6	7						
	Total	52	100	40	100	--	--	84	100						
TOTAL	+3	--	--	1	13	--	--	1	5	+3	--	50	--	50	100
AAA	+2	5	50	1	13	--	--	8	38	+2	36	7	--	57	100
SCHOOLS	+1	4	40	1	13	--	--	10	47	+1	27	7	--	66	100
	-1	--	--	1	13	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	2	22	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	1	13	--	--	1	5	-3	--	50	--	50	100
	NR	1	10	1	13	--	--	1	5						
	Total	10	100	8	100	--	--	21	100						

Table 45 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	4	33	2	11	--	--	3	16	+3	45	22	--	33	100
AA	+2	5	42	2	11	--	--	8	42	+2	33	13	--	54	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	17	7	36	--	--	6	32	+1	13	47	--	40	100
	-1	--	--	5	26	--	--	2	10	-1	--	72	--	28	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	2	11	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
	NR	1	8	1	5	--	--	--	--						
	Total	12	100	19	100	--	--	19	100						
<hr/>															
TOTAL	+3	13	43	1	8	--	--	7	16	+3	62	5	--	33	100
A	+2	6	20	3	23	--	--	10	23	+2	32	16	--	52	100
SCHOOLS	+1	11	37	3	23	--	--	18	41	+1	34	10	--	56	100
	-1	--	--	3	23	--	--	3	7	-1	--	50	--	50	100
	-2	--	--	1	8	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	1	8	--	--	1	2	-3	--	50	--	50	100
	NR	--	--	1	7	--	--	4	11						
	Total	30	100	13	100	--	--	44	100						

The "sometimes" response in the Class AAA, AA, and A schools were similar with 23, 22, and 21 percent respectively. The "no" response was higher in the Class AA schools with a 68 percent response. The Class AAA schools were the lowest with a 49 percent "no" response, and the Class A schools had a 53 percent "no" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 35 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". In addition, 41 percent of the principals rated the criterion as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". The Class AAA schools had 47 percent of the principals rate the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important", while 48 percent rated it as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". The Class AA schools had a 24 percent response to either "very important" or "moderately important" and a 44 percent response to either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". Class A schools had a 35 percent response to these two categories, and a 42 percent response to either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". Of those who responded "yes", 79 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 47). Those that responded "no" rated the criterion with a 56 percent response as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". Of those that responded "sometimes" 41 percent rated the criterion as "moderately important" and 35 percent of the principals rated the criterion

Table 47

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Have a Meeting with Him, or One of the Persons Who Will be Observing them Prior to any Formal Observation

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	21	64	7	7	--	--	2	5	+3	70	23	--	7	100	
ALL	+2	5	15	11	11	--	--	16	41	+2	16	34	--	50	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	4	12	24	24	--	--	14	35	+1	10	57	--	33	100	
	-1	--	--	33	32	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	10	10	--	--	1	3	-2	--	91	--	9	100	
	-3	--	--	6	6	--	--	1	3	-3	--	86	--	14	100	
	NR	3	9	11	10	--	--	5	13							
	Total	33	100	102	100	--	--	39	100							
TOTAL	+3	5	46	3	16	--	--	--	--	+3	63	37	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	2	18	2	11	--	--	6	67	+2	20	20	--	60	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	18	5	26	--	--	2	22	+1	22	56	--	22	100	
	-1	--	--	6	32	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	2	11	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	---	
	NR	2	18	1	4	--	--	1	11							
	Total	11	100	19	100	--	--	9	100							

Table 47 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)						
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No		Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No					
TOTAL	+3	3	60	2	6	--	--	--	--	+3	60	40	--	--	100		
AA	+2	--	--	1	3	--	--	6	55	+2	--	14	--	86	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	1	20	9	26	--	--	2	18	+1	8	75	--	17	100		
	-1	--	--	10	29	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	3	9	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100		
	-3	--	--	2	6	--	--	1	9	-3	--	67	--	33	100		
	NR	1	20	7	21	--	--	2	18								
	Total	5	100	34	100	--	--	11	100								
<hr/>																	
TOTAL	+3	13	76	2	4	--	--	2	11	+3	76	12	--	12	100		
A	+2	3	18	8	18	--	--	4	21	+2	20	53	--	27	100		
SCHOOLS	+1	1	6	10	20	--	--	10	52	+1	4	48	--	48	100		
	-1	--	--	17	35	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100		
	-2	--	--	5	10	--	--	1	5	-2	--	83	--	17	100		
	-3	--	--	4	10	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100		
	NR	--	--	3	5	--	--	2	11								
	Total	17	100	49	100	--	--	19	100								

as "slightly important".

The criterion that after a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place received a 79 percent "yes" response (Table 48). Class A schools had the highest "yes" percentage with 82 percent while Class AA schools had the lowest with a 74 percent "yes" response. In addition, 18 percent of the principals responded with a "sometimes". The "degree of importance" resulted in 79 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had the highest percentage with 82 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those responding "yes", 89 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 49). Those principals responding with "sometimes" resulted in 53 percent rating the criterion as "moderately important".

The criterion that when observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of observation objectives are used by the observer received a 41 percent "yes" response, and a 14 percent "sometimes" response (Table 50). Class A schools responded with a 44 percent "yes", while the Class AAA schools had a 36 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in a 35 percent response for either "very important" or "moderately important", while there was a 44 percent

Table 48

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, After a Teacher has been Formally Observed, a Conference is Held with the Teacher and the Observer, Where a Summarization of the Observation Takes Place

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	142	79	Very Important	96	53
No	2	1	Moderately "	47	26
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	22	12
Sometimes	32	18	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	13	7
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	31	79	Very Important	18	46
No	--	--	Moderately "	13	33
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	8	21	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	5	13
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	37	74	Very Important	26	52
No	--	--	Moderately "	15	30
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	9	18
Sometimes	13	26	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	--	--
			Total	50	100

Table 48 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	74	82	Very Important	52	57
No	2	2	Moderately "	19	21
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	10	11
Sometimes	11	12	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	1	1
Total	92	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	8	9
			Total	91	100

Table 49

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, After a Teacher has Been Formally Observed, A Conference is Held with the Teacher and the Observer, Where a Summarization of the Observation Takes Place

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
Total	+3	96	68	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
ALL	+2	30	21	--	--	--	--	17	53	+2	64	--	--	36	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	8	6	1	50	--	--	13	41	+1	36	5	--	59	100	
	-1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	50	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		7	4	--	--	--	--	2	6							
Total		142	100	2	100	--	--	32	100							
TOTAL	+3	18	58	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AAA	+2	8	26	--	--	--	--	5	63	+2	62	--	--	38	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	--	--	--	--	2	25	+1	33	--	--	37	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		4	13	--	--	--	--	1	12							
Total		31	100	--	--	--	--	8	100							

Table 49 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	26	70	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AA	+2	9	24	--	--	--	--	6	46	+2	60	--	--	40	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	2	6	--	--	--	--	7	54	+1	22	--	--	78	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	37	100	--	--	--	--	13	100							
TOTAL	+3	52	70	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
A	+2	13	18	--	--	--	--	6	55	+2	68	--	--	32	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	8	--	--	--	--	4	36	+1	160	--	--	40	100	
	-1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	50	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	3	1	50	--	--	1	9							
	Total	74	100	2	100	--	--	11	100							

Table 50

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, When Observing in a Formal
Evaluation a Checklist of Observation Objectives
Are Used by the Observer

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	73	41	Very Important	28	16
No	78	43	Moderately "	35	19
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	53	29
Sometimes	25	14	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	27	15
Total	180	100	Moderately "	8	4
			Very "	14	8
			No Response	15	9
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	14	36	Very Important	4	10
No	16	41	Moderately "	5	13
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	16	41
Sometimes	9	23	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	5	13
Total	39	100	Moderately "	2	5
			Very "	3	8
			No Response	4	10
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	19	38	Very Important	8	16
No	24	48	Moderately "	11	22
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	13	26
Sometimes	7	14	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	12	24
Total	50	100	Moderately "	1	2
			Very "	4	8
			No Response	1	2
			Total	50	100

Table 50 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	40	44	Very Important	16	18
No	38	42	Moderately "	19	21
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	24	26
Sometimes	9	10	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	10	11
Total	91	100	Moderately "	5	5
			Very "	7	8
			No Response	10	11
			Total	91	100

response for either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". The Class AAA schools had the lowest response with a 23 percent rating for either "very important" or "moderately unimportant". Class AA and A schools were similar in either "very important" or "moderately important" with a response of 38 percent and 39 percent respectively. Class AA and A schools response for either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant" was 50 percent and 38 percent respectively. Of those that responded "yes", 72 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 51). Of those that responded "no" 61 percent rated the criterion as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant". Of those that responded "sometimes" 72 percent rated the criterion as "slightly important".

The criterion that in the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance received a 72 percent "yes" response and a 17 percent "sometimes" response (Table 52). The Class AAA schools had an 82 percent "yes" response and a 15 percent "sometimes" response, while the Class AA schools had a 76 percent "yes" response and an 8 percent "sometimes" response. The Class A schools had a 65 percent "yes" response and a 24 percent "sometimes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 80 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important"

Table 51

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, When Observing in a Formal Evaluation a Checklist of Observation Objectives are Used by the Observer

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	26	36	1	1	--	--	1	4	+3	92	4	--	4	100
ALL	+2	26	36	4	5	--	--	5	20	+2	75	11	--	14	100
SCHOOLS	+1	14	18	21	28	--	--	18	72	+1	26	40	--	34	100
	-1	--	--	26	33	--	--	1	4	-1	--	96	--	4	100
	-2	--	--	8	10	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	14	18	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
	NR	7	10	4	5	--	--	--	--						
	Total	73	100	78	100	--	--	25	100						
TOTAL	+3	4	29	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
AAA	+2	4	29	1	6	--	--	--	--	+2	80	20	--	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	4	29	3	19	--	--	9	100	+1	25	18	--	57	100
	-1	--	--	5	30	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	2	13	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	3	19	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
	NR	2	13	2	13	--	--	--	--						
	Total	14	100	16	100	--	--	9	100						

Table 51 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	7	37	--	--	--	--	1	14	+3	88	--	--	12	100	
AA	+2	7	37	2	8	--	--	2	29	+2	64	18	--	18	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	5	26	4	17	--	--	4	57	+1	38	31	--	31	100	
	-1	--	--	12	50	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	4	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	4	17	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	--	--	1	4	--	--	--	--							
	Total	19	100	24	100	--	--	7	100							
TOTAL	+3	15	38	1	3	--	--	--	--	+3	94	6	--	--	100	
A	+2	15	38	1	3	--	--	3	33	+2	79	5	--	16	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	5	12	14	37	--	--	5	56	+1	21	58	--	21	100	
	-1	--	--	9	34	--	--	1	11	-1	--	90	--	10	100	
	-2	--	--	5	13	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	7	17	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	NR	5	12	1	3	--	--	--	--							
	Total	40	100	38	100	--	--	9	100							

Table 52

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Observe Teacher Performance

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	129	72	Very Important	83	46
No	1	1	Moderately "	61	34
Uncertain	14	8	Slightly "	18	10
Sometimes	32	17	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	4	2
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	14	8
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	82	Very Important	22	56
No	--	--	Moderately "	12	31
Uncertain	1	3	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	6	15	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	2	5
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	38	76	Very Important	22	44
No	1	2	Moderately "	15	30
Undertain	7	14	Slightly "	8	16
Sometimes	4	8	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	2	4
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	6
			Total	50	100

Table 52 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	59	65	Very Important	39	43
No	--	--	Moderately "	34	37
Uncertain	6	7	Slightly "	7	8
Sometimes	22	24	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	2	2
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	9	10
			Total	91	100

or "moderately important". Class AAA schools had the highest percentage with 87 percent of the principals rating the criterion as "very important" or "moderately important". Class AA schools had the lowest percentage response with 74 percent rating the criterion in these two categories. Of those that responded "sometimes", 82 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 53). Of those that responded "yes" 86 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important".

The criterion that in the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher received a 79 percent "yes" response and a 16 percent "sometimes" response (Table 54). The Class AA schools had the highest percentage with 84 percent responding "yes" and 14 percent responding with "sometimes". Class A had the lowest percent with 74 percent of the principals responding "yes" while 18 percent responded with "sometimes". The Class AAA schools had an 82 percent "yes" response and a 15 percent "sometimes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 83 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA schools had the highest percentage response in these two categories with an 86 percent response, while the Class A schools had the lowest response with 82 percent response of either "very important" or "moderately important". Of those

Table 53

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Observe Teacher Performance

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	73	57	--	--	5	37	5	16	+3	88	--	6	6	100
ALL	+2	37	29	--	--	3	21	21	66	+2	61	--	5	34	100
SCHOOLS	+1	11	9	--	--	2	14	5	16	+1	61	--	11	28	100
	-1	--	--	1	100	2	14	1	2	-1	--	25	25	50	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	8	5	--	--	2	14	--	--						
	Total	129	100	1	100	14	100	32	100						
TOTAL	+3	19	60	--	--	1	100	2	33	+3	86	--	5	9	100
AAA	+2	9	28	--	--	--	--	3	50	+2	75	--	--	25	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	6	--	--	--	--	1	17	+1	67	--	--	33	100
	-1	--	--	1	100	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	6	--	--	--	--	--	--						
	Total	32	100	1	100	1	100	6	100						

Table 53 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	22	58	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	--	100
AA	+2	9	24	--	--	2	29	4	100	+2	60	--	13	27	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	5	13	--	--	3	43	--	--	+1	63	--	37	--	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	1	14	--	--	-1	--	50	50	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	2	5	--	--	1	14	--	--							
	Total	38	100	--	--	7	100	4	100							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	32	54	--	--	4	66	3	14	+3	82	--	10	8	--	100
A	+2	19	32	--	--	1	17	14	64	+2	56	--	3	41	--	100
SCHOOLS	+1	3	5	--	--	--	--	4	18	+1	43	--	--	57	--	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	1	17	1	4	-1	--	--	--	50	--	50
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	NR	5	9	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	59	100	--	--	6	100	22	100							

Table 54

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General Have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Discuss the Observations with the Teacher

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	141	79	Very Important	87	48
No	--	--	Moderately "	63	35
Uncertain	6	3	Slightly "	16	9
Sometimes	29	16	Slightly		
No Response	4	2	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	13	7
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	32	82	Very Important	21	55
No	--	--	Moderately "	12	31
Uncertain	1	3	Slightly "	3	7
Sometimes	6	15	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	3	7
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	42	84	Very Important	25	50
No	--	--	Moderately "	17	34
Uncertain	1	2	Slightly "	7	14
Sometimes	7	14	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	1	1
			Total	50	100

Table 54 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	67	74	Very Important	41	45
No	--	--	Moderately "	34	37
Uncertain	4	4	Slightly "	6	7
Sometimes	16	18	Slightly		
No Response	4	4	Unimportant	1	1
Total	91	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	9	10
			Total	91	100

that responded "yes", 88 percent rated the criterion as "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 55). Of those that responded "sometimes" 79 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important".

The criterion that there is other formally planned input used in the teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations received a 58 percent "yes" response (Table 56). The Class AAA schools had the highest percentage with a 77 percent "yes" response, while the Class AA schools had the lowest percentage with a 46 percent "yes" response. The Class A schools had a 58 percent "yes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 61 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AAA and Class A schools had similar responses in these categories with 64 percent and 63 percent respectively. Class AA had the lowest percentage of either "very important" or "moderately important" with 54 percent of the principals rating the criterion in these two categories. Of those that responded "yes" 83 percent rated the criterion as "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 57). Of those that responded "no" 41 percent rated the criterion as either "slightly important" or "slightly unimportant" and 33 percent did not respond.

Those that were using other formally planned input in their teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations,

Table 55

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General Have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Discuss the Observations with the Teacher

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	77	55	--	--	3	50	7	24	+3	88	--	4	8	100	
ALL	+2	46	33	--	--	2	33	15	53	+2	73	--	3	24	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	10	7	--	--	1	17	5	17	+1	63	--	6	31	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	8	5	--	--	--	--	1	3							
	Total	141	100	--	--	6	100	29	100							
TOTAL	+3	20	63	--	--	--	--	1	17	+3	95	--	--	5	100	
AAA	+2	8	25	--	--	1	100	3	50	+2	67	--	8	25	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	1	3	--	--	--	--	2	33	+1	33	--	--	67	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	3	9	--	--	--	--	--	--							
	Total	32	100	--	--	1	100	6	100							

Table 55 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes		No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
TOTAL	+3	24	57	--	--	--	--	1	14	+3	96	--	--	4	100	
AA	+2	15	36	--	--	--	--	2	29	+2	88	--	--	12	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	7	--	--	1	100	3	43	+1	43	--	14	43	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		--	--	--	--	--	--	1	14							
Total		41	100	--	--	1	100	7	100							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	33	49	--	--	3	75	5	31	+3	81	--	7	12	100	
A	+2	23	34	--	--	1	25	10	63	+2	68	--	3	29	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	+1	100	--	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	6	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		5	8	--	--	--	--	--	--							
Total		67	100	--	--	4	100	16	100							

Table 56

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Statement, There is Other Formally Planned
Input Used in the Principal's Teacher Evaluation
Program Aside from Formal Observations

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	105	58	Very Important	59	33
No	47	26	Moderately "	50	28
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	30	16
Sometimes	28	16	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	8	4
Total	180	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	1	1
			No Response	31	17
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	30	77	Very Important	15	38
No	4	10	Moderately "	10	26
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	6	15
Sometimes	5	13	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	1	3
			No Response	7	18
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	23	46	Very Important	15	30
No	18	36	Moderately "	12	24
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	8	16
Sometimes	9	18	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	5	10
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	10	20
			Total	50	100

Table 56 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	52	58	Very Important	29	32
No	25	27	Moderately "	28	31
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	16	18
Sometimes	14	15	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	3	3
Total	91	100	Moderately "	1	1
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	14	15
			Total	91	100

Table 57

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding of the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, There is Other Formally Planned Input Used in the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program Aside From Formal Observations

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)				
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%						
TOTAL	+3	51	49	4	9	--	--	4	14	+3	86	7	--	7	100
ALL	+2	36	34	6	13	--	--	28	29	+2	72	12	--	16	100
SCHOOLS	+1	9	9	12	26	--	--	9	32	+1	30	40	--	30	100
	-1	1	1	7	14	--	--	--	--	-1	13	87	--	--	100
	-2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100
	-3	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100
NR		8	7	16	33	--	--	7	25						
Total		105	100	47	100	--	--	28	100						
TOTAL	+3	15	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100
AAA	+2	8	27	1	25	--	--	1	20	+2	80	10	--	10	100
SCHOOLS	+1	2	7	1	25	--	--	3	60	+1	34	16	--	50	100
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--
	-3	--	--	1	25	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	100	--	100
NR		5	16	1	25	--	--	1	20						
Total		30	100	4	100	--	--	5	100						

Table 57 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	11	48	2	11	--	--	2	22	+3	74	13	--	13	100	
AA	+2	6	26	2	11	--	--	4	45	+2	50	16	--	34	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	3	13	4	22	--	--	1	11	+1	38	50	--	12	100	
	-1	1	4	4	22	--	--	--	--	-1	20	80	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	9	6	34	--	--	2	22							
Total		23	100	18	100	--	--	9	100							
<hr/>																
TOTAL	+3	25	48	2	8	--	--	2	14	+3	85	7	--	7	100	
A	+2	22	42	3	12	--	--	3	21	+2	78	11	--	11	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	4	8	7	28	--	--	5	36	+1	25	44	--	31	100	
	-1	--	--	3	12	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	1	4	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
NR		1	2	9	36	--	--	4	29							
Total		52	100	25	100	--	--	14	100							

were asked to indicate the input. Table 58 illustrates that teacher self evaluation was the most utilized input, with the characteristic check sheet being the most frequently used tool. Student evaluations was the next most frequent input used by the schools. This was followed in frequency by the formal instruments being used as input. The most frequently used formal instrument was one that was constructed by the teacher or the district. This was also the case with student evaluations with the principals indicating that teacher constructed instruments were the most frequently utilized.

The criterion that in general the principal needs to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers received an 82 percent "yes" response (Table 59). Class AA and A schools had similar responses with an 86 percent and an 85 percent "yes" response respectively. Class AAA schools had a 72 percent "yes" response and a 13 percent "sometimes" response. The "degree of importance" resulted in 77 percent of the principals rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class A schools had the highest percentage response with 80 percent rating the criterion in these two categories. The Class AAA schools had the lowest percentage response with 69 percent rating the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important". The Class AA schools had a 78 percent response in these categories. Of those that responded

Table 58

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Question Regarding Formally Planned Input
Used in the Teacher Evaluation Program Aside
From Formal Observation

Planned Input	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
<u>TEACHER SELF- EVALUATION</u>	127	31	33	63
Characteristic Check				
Sheet	59	18	14	27
Video Tape	38	10	11	17
Questionnaires	30	5	10	15
<u>OTHER</u>				
Teacher's Written				
Objectives	7	2	2	2
Informal Visiting	6		2	4
Audio Cassettes	2	1		1
Conferences	3	2		1
Test Analysis	1	1		
In-Service	1			1
School Board Input	1	1		
<u>FORMAL INSTRUMENTS</u>	32	5	10	17
Teacher's Image				
Questionnaire	8		2	6
Flander Interaction				
Profile	7	1	1	5
<u>OTHER</u>				
District Constructed	12	3	4	5
Iowa State Model	1		1	
Purdue Research Model	1			1
Situation Learning	1			1
Evaluation Criteria	1			1
<u>STUDENT EVALUATIONS</u>	55	15	16	24
Teacher Constructed				
Instrument	23	7	6	10
Characteristic				
Checksheet	13	1	4	8
Purdue Teacher				
Evaluation	9	1	4	4

Table 58 (Continued)

Planned Input	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
<u>OTHER</u>				
District Constructed	4	1	2	1
NCA	1			1
NEA	1			1
Group Discussion	1	1		
Student Visitation	2	1		1
<u>OTHER INPUT</u>				
Department Chairman				
Critique	1	1		
Group Input of District				
Administrators	1	1		

Table 59

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Statement, In General, the Principal Needs to Devote More Time to the Process of Evaluating Teachers

TOTAL ALL SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	148	82	Very Important	90	50
No	17	9	Moderately "	49	27
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	18	10
Sometimes	12	7	Slightly		
No Response	3	2	Unimportant	1	1
Total	180	100	Moderately "	3	2
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	19	10
			Total	180	100

TOTAL AAA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	28	72	Very Important	21	54
No	4	10	Moderately "	6	15
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	3	8
Sometimes	5	13	Slightly		
No Response	2	5	Unimportant	--	--
Total	39	100	Moderately "	1	3
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	8	20
			Total	39	100

TOTAL AA SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	43	86	Very Important	25	50
No	4	8	Moderately "	14	28
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	6	12
Sometimes	2	4	Slightly		
No Response	1	2	Unimportant	1	2
Total	50	100	Moderately "	--	--
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	4	8
			Total	50	100

Table 59 (Continued)

TOTAL A SCHOOLS					
Practice is Followed	Number	Percent	Importance of Statement	Number	Percent
Yes	77	85	Very Important	44	48
No	9	10	Moderately "	29	32
Uncertain	--	--	Slightly "	9	10
Sometimes	5	5	Slightly		
No Response	--	--	Unimportant	--	--
Total	91	100	Moderately "	2	2
			Very "	--	--
			No Response	7	8
			Total	91	100

"yes" 89 percent rated the criterion as either "very important" or "moderately important" (Table 60).

Those that responded "yes" or "sometimes" to the criterion of needing to spend more time on teacher evaluation were asked to indicate the reasons they were not spending more time on teacher evaluation. Table 61 indicates the reasons the principals gave for not spending more time on evaluation. The most frequently given answer was that the principal does not have enough time. The next most frequent answer was that the superintendent has not pushed for evaluations, followed by the reason that the board of education has not pushed for evaluations.

The principals were asked to indicate the procedures that they have found to be the most effective in helping teachers correct incompetencies. Table 62 indicates the responses of the principals to what they have found to be effective. The most frequent response was principal suggestions with 119. This was followed infrequently by teacher initiated self-help with 97 responses. Peer group suggestions was the next most frequent, with 44 responses.

Table 60

Breakdown of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa Responding to the Degree of Importance Rating of the Statement, In General, the Principal Needs to Devote More Time to the Process of Evaluating Teachers

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes	Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	88	59	1	6	--	--	1	9	+3	98	1	--	1	100	
ALL	+2	44	30	1	6	--	--	4	33	+2	89	2	--	9	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	10	7	4	24	--	--	4	33	+1	56	22	--	22	100	
	-1	--	--	1	6	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	3	17	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	6	4	7	41	--	--	3	25							
	Total	148	100	17	100	--	--	12	100							
TOTAL	+3	19	68	1	25	--	--	1	20	+3	90	5	--	5	100	
AAA	+2	6	21	--	--	--	--	3	60	+2	100	--	--	--	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	+1	--	--	--	100	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	1	25	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	3	11	2	50	--	--	1	20							
	Total	28	100	4	100	--	--	5	100							

Table 60 (Continued)

	Degree of Imp.	Principal's Practice Response								Degree of Imp.	Relationship of Practice to Degree of Importance (in Percent)					Total
		Yes		No		Uncertain		Sometimes			Yes	No	Uncertain	Sometimes		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%							
TOTAL	+3	25	59	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
AA	+2	13	30	--	--	--	--	1	50	+2	93	--	--	7	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	4	9	2	50	--	--	--	--	+1	67	33	--	--	100	
	-1	--	--	1	25	--	--	--	--	-1	--	100	--	--	100	
	-2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-2	--	--	--	--	--	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	1	2	1	25	--	--	1	50							
	Total	43	100	4	100	--	--	2	100							
TOTAL	+3	44	57	--	--	--	--	--	--	+3	100	--	--	--	100	
A	+2	25	32	1	11	--	--	3	60	+2	87	3	--	10	100	
SCHOOLS	+1	6	8	2	22	--	--	1	20	+1	67	22	--	11	100	
	-1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-1	--	--	--	--	--	
	-2	--	--	2	22	--	--	--	--	-2	--	100	--	--	100	
	-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-3	--	--	--	--	--	
	NR	2	3	4	45	--	--	1	20							
	Total	77	100	9	100	--	--	5	100							

Table 61

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of
Iowa to the Question of Reasons for Not Spending More
Time on Teacher Evaluation

Reasons	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Superintendent has not Pushed for Evalua- tions	33	3	7	23
Principal Does not Have Enough Time	144	30	42	72
Board of Education has not Pushed for Evaluations	29	2	10	17
Teachers Resist Evalu- ations	20	3	5	12
Public has not Pushed for Evaluations	20	3	5	12
Principal has more Important Primary Roles	20	7	5	8
Principal Lacks Exper- tise to Evaluate	17	5	1	11
Principal Does not Want to Adversely Affect Teachers' Lives	2			2
Principal Fears Hostile Reaction from Teachers on an Adverse Evaluation	2			2
<u>OTHER</u>				
Principal Needs Goals	3	1		2
Principal Lacks Faith in Evaluation Process	3	2		1
Crowded Conditions in School	1	1		
Need an Assistant Principal	1	1		
Size of Staff	1	1		
Experienced Faculty Rarely Needs Help	1			1
Need Office Help	1			1
Principal Lacks Ambition	1			1
Principal Needs to Improve Evaluation Methods	1			1

Table 61 (Continued)

Reasons	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Principal Needs to Budget Time	1			1
Principal Teaches Classes	1			1
Have a Self-Help Evaluation Program	1			1
Spend Majority of the Time Evaluating New Teachers	1			1

Table 62

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the Question of the Procedures that Principals Have Found to be Most Effective in Helping Teachers Correct Incompetencies

Procedures	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Principal Suggestions	119	26	33	60
Teacher Initiated				
Self Help	97	26	22	49
Peer Group Suggestions	44	13	14	17
Outside Consultants	17	8	3	6
<u>OTHER</u>				
Teacher Principal Discussion	3			3
Develop Objectives	3	2		1
Department Chairman	2	1	1	
Student Evaluation	2		1	1
Visiting Other Teachers	1			1
Praise	1			1
Promotion	1			1

The principals were asked to indicate the greatest strength of their teacher evaluation program. Table 63 indicates the responses of the principals. The most frequent response was that the evaluation process was for instructional improvement, with 25. The next most frequent response was the conference between principal and teacher, with 19 responses.

The principals were also asked to indicate the greatest weakness of their teacher evaluation program. Table 64 indicates the responses of the principals. The most frequent response was not enough time to evaluate, with 53

Table 63

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the
Question Regarding the Greatest Strength of Their Teacher
Evaluation Program

Strengths	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Evaluation for Instructional Improvement	25	11	6	8
Conference Between Principal and Teacher	19	6	6	7
Informal Evaluations	15	1	2	12
Faculty Wants Evaluations	14	1		13
Rapport	12		6	6
Teacher Input in Construction of the Evaluation Program	11	5	2	4
Objectives	11	4	3	4
Teamwork and Cooperation	11	8	3	
Evaluation Program Non-Threatening	8		3	5
Teacher Understands Evaluating Process	8		3	5
Openness	7	1		6
Teacher Knows Strengths and Weaknesses	7	1	2	4
Self Evaluation	4	1	3	
Evaluation Program Praises Teachers	3			3
Followup	3		1	2
Student Oriented	3		3	
Honest Reports	2	1		1
Evaluation is Continuous Process	2			2
Individualized	2			2
Mutual Trust	2			2
Flexible	2		1	1

Table 63 (Continued)

Strengths	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Effective	2		2	
Teachers Feel Evaluation is Fair	2		2	
Consistency	2	1	1	
Communication	2		2	
Length of Observations	2	2		
People Involved in the Observation Process	2	2		
More than one Evaluation	1			1
Thorough Evaluation on Inexperienced	1			1
Teacher Concerned About Christian Growth	1			1
Forces the Principal to Evaluate	1			1
Evaluation is Learning Situation	1		1	
Formal Visits	1		1	
Job Security	1	1		
Inclusive Instrument	1	1		
Teacher Awareness of What is in File	1	1		
Peer Evaluation	1	1		
Written Suggestions	1	1		
Simple	1	1		
Evaluation Program Developed by Teachers				
Board Members and Administrators	1		1	

Table 64

Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa to the
Question Regarding the Greatest Weakness of Their Teacher
Evaluation Program

Weaknesses	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Not Enough Time to Evaluate	53	15	12	26
Not Enough Observations	31	4	8	19
Need Another Person Evaluating	11	2	5	4
Evaluation Instrument	9	3	6	
Not Comprehensive Enough	7	2	1	4
Teachers Fearful of Evaluations	7	3	1	3
Need Followup	6	1	1	4
Lack of Organization	6	4		2
Need to Spend More Time on Evaluation	5		5	
Lack of Measurable Items	5		1	4
Defensive Attitude of Teachers	4			4
Board Sees Evaluations as Punitive	3			3
Evaluator not Trained	3			3
Evaluation Used for Renewal of Contracts	2			2
Not Enough Self Evaluation	2			2
No Grievance Procedure	2			2
Too Time Consuming	2	1		1
Classroom Control	2			2
Evaluation Fails to Point Out Weaknesses	2		1	1
Inflexible	2		1	1
More Teacher Involvement	2		2	
Haven't Made Evaluation a Priority	2	1	1	

Table 64 (Continued)

Weaknesses	Total Response	AAA School Response	AA School Response	A School Response
Presentation Methods of the Teacher	2	1	1	
No Teacher Motivation for Improvement	2	2		
Don't Reward Good Teacher	1			1
Department Chairmen Don't Evaluate Effectively	1			1
Beginning Teacher Poorly Prepared	1			1
Teacher "Acts" When Being Evaluated	1			1
Evaluation is not for Improvement	1			1
Evaluator Needs to be Pushed	1			1
Teacher's Association	1			1
Evaluation Program Needs Re-Evaluated	1			1
Need Peer Evaluation	1			1
Too Subjective	1			1
Need More Teacher Conferences	1			1
Lack of Student Participation	1			1
Too General	1			1
Lack of Consistent Procedures	1		1	
Need Definition of a "Good Teacher"	1		1	
Principal's Lack of Expertise	1		1	
Lack of Objectives	1	1		
Lack of Defined Procedures	1	1		
Make a Good Teacher Out of a Poor One	1	1		
Articulation K-12	1	1		
More Written Evaluations Needed	1	1		
Early Deadline for Written Evaluations	1	1		

responses. This was followed in frequency by not enough observations made of teachers, with 31 responses.

There were 26 teacher evaluation criteria identified in the questionnaire. In addition, there were nine questions that were clarification questions requiring additional data from the principals regarding one of the criteria. Table 65 pertains to the 26 criteria questions. For comparison sake, each question is stated and the percentage response is given for the total schools, as well as each school classification. In addition, the percentage response is also given for the total that responded with +3 (very important) or +2 (moderately important), in each category.

In general, out of the twenty-six criteria outlined in Table 65, six of the criteria were not being used by a majority of principals. Four of the criteria were not rated as either "very important" or "moderately important" by a majority of the principals. Eleven criteria received a 75 percent or better "yes" response by the principals. Fourteen of the 26 criteria were rated by 75 percent or more of the principals as either "very important" or "moderately important". A complete summary of the responses to the criteria will be discussed in Chapter four, followed by conclusions, and recommendations.

Table 65

Summary of Responses of Selected Secondary Principals in the State of Iowa
to the Twenty-Six Teacher Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Total Response Yes +3+2		AAA School Response Yes +3+2		AA School Response Yes +3+2		A School Response Yes +3+2	
This School District has a Written Philosophy Stating District Goals and or Objectives	84%	82%	90%	80%	80%	80%	84%	84%
All Members of the Principals Teaching Staff Have Their Instructional Objectives Identified in Printed Form	49%	76%	54%	82%	54%	78%	44%	73%
The School District has a Formal Written Description of the Teacher Evaluation Process	67%	70%	79%	72%	66%	72%	62%	70%
The Teachers Were Involved in the Develop- ment of the Evaluation Program	72%	76%	81%	80%	76%	87%	65%	68%
Teacher Evaluation is one of the Top Priorities of this School District	53%	69%	59%	84%	64%	74%	44%	65%
The Teacher Evaluation Program Assesses Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of Each Teacher	79%	84%	82%	80%	78%	90%	78%	82%
The Main Goal of the Teacher Evaluation Program is the Improvement of Instruction	90%	90%	90%	93%	92%	96%	89%	87%

Table 65 (Continued)

Criteria	Total		AAA		AA		A	
	Response		School		School		School	
	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2
The School District has an Appeal Procedure Established for the Teacher in Case the Teacher Disagrees with the Administrative Evaluation	59%	60%	72%	70%	64%	72%	51%	50%
The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Know What is Written in Their Evaluation File	90%	86%	96%	87%	94%	90%	87%	83%
The School District has a Written Dismissal Procedure for Teachers	63%	72%	77%	75%	68%	76%	54%	68%
The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Understand the Whole Process of the Teacher Evaluation Program	59%	80%	59%	82%	58%	80%	59%	78%
The School District has a Policy of Constantly Evaluating and Updating the Teacher Evaluation Program	44%	63%	62%	72%	34%	60%	42%	61%
The Outstanding Teacher as Identified by the Teacher Evaluation Program is Recognized and/or Rewarded in Some Way Other Than a Written Evaluation	3%	25%	3%	23%	6%	30%	2%	22%
Formal Observations, Involving Classroom Visitations in Order to Objectively Evaluate the Teacher's Instructional Performance is Utilized in the Principal's Evaluation Program	89%	77%	90%	85%	90%	74%	89%	76%

Table 65 (Continued)

Criteria	Total Response		AAA School Response		AA School Response		A School Response	
	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2
The Reliability of the Formal Observation of a Teacher increases with the Number of Formal Observations of that Teacher	59%	57%	59%	59%	52%	54%	63%	58%
Formal Observations are Made More Frequently on Inexperienced Teachers on the Principal's Staff	88%	83%	92%	85%	94%	84%	84%	82%
The Formal Observation Process will be More Reliable if More than One Person is Involved in the Observing Process	75%	64%	85%	74%	76%	62%	73%	60%
The Formal Observation is for the Length of the Class Period or Long Enough to Objectively Observe the Activity of the Class	87%	77%	82%	79%	88%	74%	88%	77%
The Teachers on the Principal's Staff are Informed in Advance as to When a Formal Evaluation will be Taking Place	29%	45%	26%	41%	24%	48%	33%	44%
The Teachers on the Principal's Staff Have a Meeting with Him, or One of the Persons Who Will be Observing Them Prior to any Formal Observation	18%	35%	28%	47%	10%	24%	19%	35%

Table 65 (Continued)

Criteria	Total		AAA		AA		A	
	Response		School		School		School	
	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2	Yes	+3+2
After a Teacher has Been Formally Observed, a Conference is Held with the Teacher and the Observer, Where a Summarization of the Observation Takes Place	79%	79%	79%	79%	74%	82%	82%	78%
When Observing in a Formal Evaluation a Checklist of Observation Objectives are Used by the Observer	41%	35%	36%	23%	38%	38%	44%	39%
In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Observe Teacher Performance	72%	80%	82%	87%	76%	74%	65%	80%
In the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program, the Observers in General Have Sufficient Skill to Objectively Discuss the Observa- tions with the Teacher	79%	83%	82%	86%	84%	84%	74%	82%
There is Other Formally Planned Input Used in the Principal's Teacher Evaluation Program Aside From Formal Observations	58%	61%	77%	64%	46%	54%	58%	63%
In General the Principal Needs to Devote More Time to the Process of Evaluating Teachers	82%	77%	72%	69%	86%	78%	85%	80%

Chapter 4

SUMMARY

The questionnaire contained 35 questions pertaining to the principal's teacher evaluation program. There were 26 teacher evaluation criteria identified in the questionnaire. Nine of the questions were clarification questions requiring additional data from the principals regarding the criteria. Table 65, in Chapter 3, lists the criteria questions and the percentage responses given for the "yes" practice. In addition, the percentage response is given for the "degree of importance" of +3 (very important) or +2 (moderately important). This gives a comparison summary of the criteria that is practiced and the criteria that is rated with a higher degree of importance by the secondary principals.

Six of the criteria were not being practiced by a majority of principals. The criteria were:

1. All members of the principal's staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.
2. The school district has a policy of constantly evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program.
3. The outstanding teacher, as identified by the teacher evaluation program is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation.
4. The teachers on the principal's staff are informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place.
5. The teachers on the principal's staff have a meeting with him, or one of the persons who will be observing prior to any formal observation.

6. When observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of objectives are used by the observer.

Four of the criteria were not rated as either +3 (very important) or +2 (moderately important) by a majority of the principals. They include the following:

1. The outstanding teacher, as identified by the teacher evaluation program is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation.
2. The teachers on the principal's staff are informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place.
3. The teachers on the principal's staff have a meeting with him, or one of the persons who will be observing prior to any formal observation.
4. When observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of objectives are used by the observer.

There were eleven criteria that were practiced by 75 percent or more of the principals. They include the following:

1. This school district has a written philosophy stating district goals and/or objectives.
2. The teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher.
3. The main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction.
4. The teachers on the principal's staff know what is written in their evaluation file.
5. Formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teachers instructional performance is utilized in the principal's evaluation program.
6. Formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on the principal's staff.
7. The formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process.

8. The formal observation is for the length of the class period or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class.
9. After a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place.
10. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher.
11. In general, the principal needs to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers.

Fourteen of the twenty-six criteria were rated as either +3 (very important) or +2 (moderately important) by 75 percent or more of the principals. They include:

1. This school district has a written philosophy stating district goals and/or objectives.
2. All members of the principal's staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.
3. The teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program.
4. The teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher.
5. The main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction.
6. The teachers on the principal's staff know what is written in their evaluation file.
7. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.
8. Formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teacher's instructional performance is utilized in the principal's evaluation program.
9. Formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on the principal's staff.

10. The formal observation is for the length of the class period or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class.
11. After a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place.
12. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.
13. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher.
14. In general, the principal needs to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers.

Of the criteria rated as either "very important" or "moderately important" by 75 percent of the principals, there were four that were not practiced by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. Those criteria include the following:

1. All members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.
2. The teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program.
3. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.
4. In the principal's teacher evaluation program the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.

The Class AAA, AA, and A schools agreed on some of the criteria with respect to practice as well as degree of importance. There were four criteria that none of the classes

rated above the 50 percent level in practice or degree of importance. Those criteria include the following:

1. The outstanding teacher, as identified by the teacher evaluation program is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation.
2. The teachers on the principal's staff are informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place.
3. The teachers on the principal's staff have a meeting with him, or one of the persons who will be observing them prior to any formal observation.
4. When observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of observation objectives are used by the observer.

In addition, Class AA schools had two criteria that they rated collectively above the 50 percent level as either "very important" or "moderately important", but the practice response of the principals was below 50 percent. Those criteria included (1) The school district has a policy of constantly evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program, and (2) There is other formally planned input used in our teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations.

The Class A schools rated collectively three criteria above 50 percent as either "very important" or "moderately important". The practice, however, of the principals was below 50 percent "yes". Those criteria included (1) All members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form, (2) Teacher evaluation is one of the top priorities of this school district, and (3) The school district has a policy of constantly

evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program.

There were five criteria that the Class AAA, AA, and A schools practiced with a 75 percent, or more, response and were rated collectively as either "very important" or "moderately important" by a 75 percent majority. They included the following criteria:

1. This school district has a written philosophy stating district goals and/or objectives.
2. The teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher.
3. The main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction.
4. The teachers on the principal's staff know what is written in their evaluation file.
5. Formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on the principal's staff.

In addition, there were three criteria that the Class AAA and A schools indicated were being practiced by 75 percent, or more, and rated as "very important" or "moderately important" by 75 percent or more of the principals. They included the criteria, (1) The teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program, and (2) In the principal's teacher evaluation program the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher.

There was one criterion that the Class AA and A schools had indicated that 75 percent, or more, practiced and 75 percent or more rated as "very important" or "moderately

important". The criterion was in general the principal needs to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers.

The Class AAA school's indicated that 15 criteria were practiced by 75 percent or more of the principals. Fifteen criteria received a "very important" or "moderately important" rating by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. Ten of these criteria have been included in preceeding lists. The other five include the following criteria for Class AAA schools.

- PRACTICE:
1. The school district has a formal written description of the teacher evaluation process.
 2. The school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers.
 3. The formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process.
 4. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.
 5. There is other formally planned input used in our teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations.

DEGREE OF
IMPORTANCE:

1. All members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.
2. Teacher evaluation is one of the top priorities of this school district.
3. The school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers.

4. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.
5. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.

The Class AA schools indicated twelve criteria were practiced by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. The Class AA schools also rated twelve criteria either as "very important" or "moderately important" by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. Eight of these criteria have been discussed. The other four include the following criteria for Class AA schools.

- PRACTICE:
1. Formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teacher's instructional performance is utilized in the principal's evaluation program.
 2. The formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process.
 3. The formal observation is for the length of the class period or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class.
 4. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.

DEGREE OF
IMPORTANCE:

1. All members of the principal's teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.
2. The school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers.

3. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.
4. After a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place.

The Class A schools indicated nine criteria were practiced by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. All of those criteria have been identified with the preceding discussion. The Class A schools also rated twelve criteria either as "very important" or "moderately important" by 75 percent, or more, of the principals. Nine of these criteria have been discussed. The other three include the following criteria for Class A schools.

DEGREE OF
IMPORTANCE:

1. The teachers on the principal's staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.
2. In the principal's teacher evaluation program, the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.
3. In the principal's teacher evaluation program the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher.

There were six criteria where there was a difference between the response of the Class AAA, AA, and A schools by 19 percent or more, in relation to practice or degree of importance. The Class AAA and A schools had a difference of 19 percent or more in the "yes" practice response with the criteria relating to the (1) appeal procedure for teachers,

(2) dismissal procedure for teachers, (3) other input in the evaluation program, and (4) the constant evaluation of the teacher evaluation program. The Class AAA and A schools had one criterion where the degree of importance rating had a 19 percent, or greater, margin. That was the criterion relating to teacher evaluation being a priority of the school district.

The Class AAA and Class AA schools had a difference of 28 percent in the "yes" response in the criteria relating to (1) the policy of constant evaluation of the teacher evaluation program, and a difference of 31 percent in the criteria relating to (2) other input in the evaluation program. There was one criterion where the difference between the degree of importance was 23 percent between the Class AAA and AA schools. That criterion related to conferences being held with the teacher prior to observation.

The Class AA and Class A schools had one criterion where there was a difference of 20 percent which was the "yes" response to the criterion that teacher evaluation is a priority of the school district. There was one criterion relating to the appeal procedure for teachers where there was a difference of 21 percent between the Class AA and A schools. There was also a difference of 19 percent between the Class AA and A schools regarding the criterion relating to the teachers being involved in the development of the evaluation program.

All of the schools indicated that the principal was

involved to a large extent in teacher evaluation. There was little difference in the number of teacher evaluations on each teacher; the main difference being the number of evaluations conducted by the principal himself; with the Class AAA schools having a smaller number than the Class AA and A schools. There was also little difference in the total number of minutes spent in formal evaluations. There was general agreement by all the principals that they lack the time to evaluate.

CONCLUSIONS

The first major purpose of this study was to identify criteria for a teacher evaluation program. Criteria, according to some authorities, were identified as being important ingredients in a teacher evaluation program. The data indicates that the criteria, in general, were important to the majority of principals. There were 22 of the 26 criteria that recieved a majority of principals indicating the importance of the criterion as either very important or moderately important. There were 20 of the 26 criteria that were practiced by 50 percent or more of the principals. Thus, the majority of the teacher evaluation criteria in this study is important to the majority of principals who responded in this study.

The second major purpose of this study was to sample the teacher evaluation practices of the secondary school

principals, and determine to what extent they were following the criteria. The results of the study indicate that the majority of the principals were practicing the criteria indicated by the questionnaire. There were six out of 26 criteria that less than 50 percent of the principals were practicing. These six criteria were all related to staff input or participation. The majority of the remaining 20 relate to the principal's input or function.

The third major purpose of the study was to determine the degree of importance the secondary principals placed on the criteria. Thus, the degree of importance would indicate what is important to principals in a teacher evaluation program. There were four criteria that were not indicated by a majority as either "very important" or "moderately important". These four criteria were all related to pre-evaluation preparation with the teacher and recognition of ability following the evaluation. It would also appear that a large majority of "slightly important", "slightly unimportant", "moderately unimportant" and "very unimportant", came from principals who indicated they did not, or seldom practiced the criteria.

The fourth major purpose of the study was to compare the teacher evaluation practices of different sized schools. In general, the Class AAA, AA, and A schools had agreement on the 26 major criteria. In addition, all of the schools indicated that the principal was involved to a large extent

in teacher evaluation. Also there was little difference in the number of teacher evaluations on each teacher, or the total number of minutes spent in formal evaluations. There was general agreement by all the administrators that lack of time to evaluate was their main weakness.

Thus, it would seem that the majority of teacher evaluation criteria identified in this study is being practiced in the State of Iowa. It would seem that the majority of teacher evaluation criteria identified in this study has importance to the principals in the State of Iowa. In addition, it would also seem that regardless of the size of school, there are similarities that exist between the teacher evaluation programs of all schools in the State of Iowa.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The main implication of this study is that it has identified some teacher evaluation criteria. The study has also identified some of the practices of the high school principals in the State of Iowa in relation to these criteria. The study has also indicated the degree of importance that the principals in this study place on different evaluation criteria. Thus, this study blends some information from theory and practice regarding teacher evaluation.

According to the literature, administrators in this country must start devoting more time and energy to teacher

evaluation. Administrators must make it one of their priorities. The theory of teacher evaluation is based on the idea that improved supervision will result in the improvement of instruction. The principal that is concerned about teacher evaluation should look at teacher evaluation criteria, teacher evaluation practices, and the importance different administrators put on different evaluation criteria. Hopefully some of the data in this study will be a start for an administrator that is concerned about teacher evaluation.

The following recommendations result from this study:

1. This study should be replicated on a different sample group.
2. This study should be used by administrators who are starting to develop a teacher evaluation program, because it identifies some evaluation criteria, as well as the importance given to the criteria by secondary principals.
3. That a study be made using the teacher and their perceptions of the importance of the criteria.
4. Recommend a study of teacher evaluation programs as to their effectiveness in improving instruction.
5. That teachers be involved more at all levels of the evaluation process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

- Amidon, Edmund, and Elizabeth Hunter. Improving Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Biddle, Bruce J. "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, pp. 18-30.
- Biddle, Bruce J., and William J. Ellena. Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Davis, Hazel. "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, pp. 54-56.
- Fattu, N. A. "Research on Teacher Evaluation," Selected Readings on General Supervision, ed. James E. Heald. New York: Macmillan Company, 1970, pp. 279-291.
- Flanders, Ned A. "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, pp. 221-230.
- Gump, Paul V. "Environmental Guidance of the Classroom Behavioral System," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, pp. 180-182.
- Houston, Robert W., and Robert B. Howsom. Competency Based Teacher Education. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972.
- Jacobson, Paul B., William C. Reavis, and Janes D. Longsdon. The Effective School Principal. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.
- McDonald, Fredrick J., Robert W. Houston, and Robert B. Howsom. "Evaluation of Teaching Behavior," Competency Based Teacher Education. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1972, pp. 56-74.
- Meux, Milton B., and Othael Smith. "Logical Dimensions of Teaching Behavior," Contemporary Research of Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, pp. 163-165.

- Morphet, Edgar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Perkins, Hugh V. "A Procedure for Assessing the Classroom Behavior of Students and Teachers," Studying Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, pp. 69-74.
- Raths, James, John Pancella, and James S. Van Ness. Studying Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Reeder, Ward G. The Fundamentals of Public School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Waimon, Morton D. "Feedback in Classrooms: A Study of Corrective Teacher Responses," Studying Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, pp. 80-84.

2. Periodicals

- Barsalou, Judith M., June E. Killinger, and June E. Thompson. "Student Evaluation of Staff in Secondary Schools," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #379 (February, 1974), pp. 10-15.
- Berger, Eric. "The Evaluation of Teachers," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #382 (May, 1974), 147-152.
- Bushman, John H. "Are Teachers Playing Statue in the Classroom?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 25-37.
- Cardellichio, Thomas L. "Evaluating Teachers Methods," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 8-12.
- Griffith, Francis. "Is There Any Hope for New York City Schools?" National Association Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LV (March, 1971), 1-12.
- Hall, George L. "Assessing Staff Effectiveness," National Association of Secondary School Principals, LVIII, #382 (May, 1974), 153-163.
- Hansen, Merrell, J. "Administration: Role and Function in Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 82-89.

- Heller, M. P. "Involvement of the Involved," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #387 (December, 1974), 44-47.
- Holt, Howard B. "Everything You Need to Know About Supervision," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 48-50.
- Husacik, Ernest A., and Robert J. Wynkoop. "A Principal's Dilemma: Can Supervising be Collegial?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIX, #387 (January, 1975), 13-19.
- Klotz, Jack, and Ken Semmann. "Supervision in Today's Labor Management," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 20-24.
- Ovard, Glen F. "The Practitioners Guide to Research Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIX, #387 (January, 1975), 87-94.
- Quirk, Thomas J. "Teacher Accountability Negative and Positive," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVII, #377 (December, 1973), 31-41.
- Saunders, Jack, and Robert E. Wright, "Good Teachers Loud and Clear," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 38-43.
- Thomas, Donald. "The Principal and Teacher Evaluation," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVIII, #386 (December, 1974), 1-7.

3. Other Sources

- "Administrator's Problem--Teachers Fear Evaluation," National Association of Secondary Administrators, Washington, NASSP Spotlight, 22, #8 (April, 1975), 4.
- Bolten, Dale. Principal's Audio Journal. St. Paul: Cassette Services, Inc., April, 1974.
- Hughes, Larry W. Principal's Audio Journal. St. Paul: Cassette Services, Inc., April, 1974.
- Iowa State Education Association. Who's a Good Teacher. Des Moines, Iowa: Iowa State Education Association, 1971. Reprinted in part from report published by Joint Committee on Personnel Procedures from California School Board Association, and California Teachers Association.

Lifton, Fred, and Wesley Wildman. Analysis of Education Associations Proposed Comprehensive Level IV Teachers Bargaining Agreement. Chicago: Illinois Association of School Boards, May, 1972.

Millard, Joseph E. Teacher Evaluation Systems. Ankeny: Joint County School Systems, September, 1974.

NEA Research Bulletin, ed. Beatrice Lee, XLVII (October, 1969), 72.

PREP. Paper #21: Teacher Evaluation. Washington: United States Department of Health Education and Welfare, 1972.

Sampling and Statistics Handbook for Surveys in Education. Washington: Research Division of the National Education Association, 1965, Line 5, Table J.1, p. 131.

Ubben, Gerald C. Principal's Audio Journal. St. Paul: Cassette Services, Inc, April, 1974.

Weidner, Ray. Principal's Audio Journal. St. Paul: Cassette Services, Inc., April, 1974.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____ Enrollment 9-12 _____

Number of Teachers on Your Staff 9-12 _____ 10-12 _____

Total Number of Professional Staff Members (including Teachers) 9-12 _____

10-12 _____

The following items refer to your specific situation. For each item please give your response to the statement, either "yes", "no", "uncertain", or "sometimes". Then, regardless of your response, indicate the degree of importance you place on the activity or idea expressed in that item by circling the appropriate number. The scale is as follows:

- +3 = very important
- +2 = moderately important
- +1 = slightly important
- 1 = slightly unimportant
- 2 = moderately unimportant
- 3 = very unimportant

1. This school district has a written philosophy stating district goals and/or objectives.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

2. All members of my teaching staff have their instructional objectives identified in printed form.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

3. The school district has a formal written description of the teacher evaluation process.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

3a. If Yes to item three, please answer.

The teachers were involved in the development of the evaluation program.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

4. Teacher Evaluation is one of the top priorities of this school district.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

5. The teacher evaluation program assesses specific strengths and weaknesses of each teacher.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

6. The Main goal of the teacher evaluation program is the improvement of instruction.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

7. The school district has an appeal procedure established for the teacher in case the teacher disagrees with the administrative evaluation.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

8. The teachers on my staff know what is written in their evaluation file.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

9. The school district has a written dismissal procedure for teachers.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

10. The teachers on my staff understand the whole process of the teacher evaluation program.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

11. The school district has a policy of constantly evaluating and updating the teacher evaluation program.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

12. The outstanding teacher, as identified by your teacher evaluation program, is recognized and/or rewarded in some way other than a written evaluation.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

- 12a. If the answer was "Yes" or "sometimes" to item twelve, please specify:

_____ money
 _____ board commendation
 _____ community acknowledgement
 _____ other _____

13. Formal observations, involving classroom visitations in order to objectively evaluate the teachers instructional performance, is utilized in my teacher evaluation program.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

Item 13a through Item 23 relate to formal observations. If your response to Item 13 was "Yes" or "sometimes," please continue with item 13a. If your response was "No", please go to item 24 and continue from there.

- 13a. People involved in our formal observations: Please specify:

_____ Principal _____ teachers
 _____ Assistant principal _____ curriculum
 _____ Superintendent _____ specialists
 _____ Department Chairman _____ Other (please specify)

14. The reliability of the formal observation of a teacher increases with the number of formal observations of that teacher.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

- 14a. The number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on my staff?

_____ Minimum
_____ Maximum

- 14b. The number of formal evaluations conducted on teachers on my staff by me?

_____ Minimum
_____ Maximum

15. Formal observations are made more frequently on inexperienced teachers on my staff.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

16. The formal observation process will be more reliable if more than one person is involved in the observing process.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

17. The formal observation is for the length of the class period, or long enough to objectively observe the activity of the class.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

- 17a. The average length of my formal observation?

_____ Minutes

18. The teachers on my staff are informed in advance as to when a formal evaluation will be taking place.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

19. The teachers on my staff have a meeting with me or one of the persons who will be observing them prior to any formal observation. This conference is to plan activities to be observed, goals to be identified, problems anticipated, strategy of teaching, how evaluations will take place, etc.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

20. After a teacher has been formally observed, a conference is held with the teacher and the observer, where a summarization of the observation takes place.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

21. When observing in a formal evaluation a checklist of observation objectives are used by the observer.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

22. In our teacher evaluation program the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively observe teacher performance.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

23. In our teacher evaluation program the observers in general have sufficient skill to objectively discuss the observations with the teacher.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes _____ Uncertain

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

24. There is other formally planned input used in our teacher evaluation program aside from formal observations.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

24a. If your response to Item 21 was "Yes" or "sometimes," please check the appropriate categories:

- ☐ Teacher self evaluation
 ☐ Video Tape
 ☐ Questionnaires
 ☐ Characteristic Checksheet
 ☐ Other _____

- ☐ Formal Instruments
 ☐ Flanders Interaction Profile (or similar)
 ☐ Teacher Image Questionnaire
 ☐ Vics
 ☐ Other _____

- ☐ Student Evaluations
 ☐ Purdue Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire
 ☐ Teacher Constructed Instrument
 ☐ Characteristic Checksheet
 ☐ Other _____

- ☐ Other (Please Describe) _____

25. In general, I need to devote more time to the process of evaluating teachers.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Sometimes

Degree of Importance +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

25a. If your response was "Yes" or "sometimes", please check the appropriate items. Reasons for not spending more time on teacher evaluation:

- ☐ Superintendent has not pushed for evaluations
☐ Teachers resist evaluations
☐ Board of Education has not pushed for Evaluations
☐ Public has not pushed for evaluations
☐ Principal has more important primary roles
☐ Principal does not have enough time
☐ Principal does not want to adversely affect teachers' lives
☐ Principal lacks expertise to evaluate
☐ Principal fears hostile reaction from teachers on an adverse evaluation
☐ Other _____

26. From my experience the procedure I have found to be most effective in helping teachers correct incompetencies is (check the appropriate item):

☐ Principal suggestions
☐ Peer group suggestions
☐ Outside consultants
☐ Teacher initiated self help
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

27. The greatest strength of our teacher evaluation program?

28. The greatest weakness of our teacher evaluation program?

If you wish to add comments, please put them on the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPALS RECEIVING QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1A Earl Bridgewater, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
East High School
815 E. 13th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50316
- 1B Gerald Dockum, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
Hoover High School
4800 Aurora Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50310
- 1C Melvin J. Bowen, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
Lincoln High School
2600 Southwest 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50315
- 1D Rolland E. Brownell, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
North High School
501 Holcomb Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50313
- 1E Bruce D. Gardner, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
Roosevelt High School
4419 Center Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
- 1F Donald Blackman, Principal
Des Moines Independent Comm. School District
Des Moines Tech High School
1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50307
- 2A Lawrence Gehring, Jr., Principal
Davenport Comm. School District
Central High School
1120 Main Street
Davenport, Iowa 52803
- 2B Keith Mattke, Director
Davenport Community School District
Center for Vocational Education
1002 W. Kimberly
Davenport, Iowa 52803

- 2C Robert John Liddy, Principal
Davenport Comm. School District
West High School
3505 West Locust
Davenport, Iowa 52804
- 3A Richard Miles
Central High School
1350 South Hackett Road
Waterloo, Iowa 50701
- 3B Alan Krebs
East High School
214 High Street
Waterloo, Iowa 50701
- 3C Gerald Fain
West High School
Baltimore and Ridgeway
Waterloo, Iowa 50701
- 4A Don H. Kolsrud, Principal
Dubuque Comm. School District
Dubuque Senior High School
1800 Clarke Drive
Dubuque, Iowa 52001
- 5 Robert Bargman, Principal
Fort Dodge Comm. School District
Fort Dodge High School
819 N. 25th Street
Fort Dodge, Iowa 50501
- 6 John A. Finnessey, Principal
Marshalltown Comm. High School District
Marshalltown High School
1602 South 2nd Avenue
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158
- 7 Lewis Dye
Ottumwa High School
Second & College
Ottumwa, Iowa 52501
- 8 John B. Patzwald, Principal
Mason City Comm. School District
Mason City High School
1700 Fourth Southeast
Mason City, Iowa 50401

- 9 Ralph Farrar
Ames Community School District
20th and Ridgewood
Ames, Iowa 50010
- 10 C. Robert Bennett
Newton Senior High School
East 4th Street
Newton, Iowa 50208
- 11 Ernest Doeringsfeld
Urbandale Community High School
7111 Aurora Avenue
Urbandale, Iowa 50322
- 12 Tommy D. Sheldahl, Principal
Keokuk Comm. School District
Keokuk High School
2285 Middle Road
Keokuk, Iowa 52632
- 13 Edward A. Fischer
North Scott Comm. High School
200 South 1st Street
Eldridge, Iowa 52748
- 14 Ralph Edward Buchman
Western Dubuque High School
Epworth, Iowa 52045
- 15 Clarence E. Miles
Lewis Central Senior High School
Highway 275
Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501
- 16 Virgil D. Hudson, Principal
Boone Comm. School District
Boone High School
621 Crawford Street
Boone, Iowa 50036
- 17 Keith Allenstein
Pleasant Valley High School
Belmont Road
Pleasant Valley, Iowa 52767
- 18 Joe D. Reed, Principal
LeMars Comm. School District
LeMars High School
921 Third Avenue Southwest
LeMars, Iowa 51031

- 19 Walter A. Rixen, Principal
Grinnell-Newburg Comm. School District
Grinnell Comm. Senior High School
Box 269
1333 Sunset Street
Grinnell, Iowa 50112
- 20 William Mullenberg
Spencer High School
800 East 3rd Street
Spencer, Iowa 50301
- 21 Willard Prather, Principal
Knoxville Comm. School District
Knoxville High School
102 North Lincoln Street
Knoxville, Iowa 50138
- 22 W. G. Hatfield, Principal
Independence Comm. School District
514 Fifth Avenue Southeast
Independence, Iowa 50644
- 23 Robert L. Campbell
Waukon High School
1105 3rd Avenue N.W.
Waukon, Iowa 52172
- 24 Chris Kjar, Principal
Estherville Comm. School District
Estherville High School
1520 Central Avenue
Estherville, Iowa 51334
- 25 Burge Hammond
Washington High School
313 South Fourth Avenue
Washington, Iowa 52353
- 26 Howard Albert Ehrler, Principal
Central Clinton Comm. School District
Central High School
Highway 30 East
DeWitt, Iowa 52742
- 27 Paul Everett Johnson, Principal
Centerville Comm. School District
Centerville High School
10th and Liberty
Centerville, Iowa 52544
- 28 Richard Paul Euchner
Storm Lake Senior High School
621 Tornado Drive
Storm Lake, Iowa 50588

- 29 Grover Carl Hedemann, Principal
Decorah Comm. School District
Thos. Roberts High School
Claiborne Drive
Decorah, Iowa 52101
- 30 Larry K. Shiley, Principal
Cherokee Comm. School District
Washington High School
600 West Bluff Street
Cherokee, Iowa 51012
- 31 John Rawlings
Washington High School
212 West 15th
Vinton, Iowa 52349
- 32 H. Elgin Allen
Algona Comm. School District
Sample and Grove
Algona, Iowa 50511
- 33 Ottlin August Wegner
Davis County Comm. School District
Davis County Comm. High School
106 North East Street
Bloomfield, Iowa 52537
- 34 Eugene Ralph Brady
Perry Community High School
Perry, Iowa 50220
- 35 Alfred O. Swenson
Osage High School
South 7th
Osage, Iowa 50461
- 36 Robert Blasi, Principal
Glenwood Comm. School District
Glenwood Senior High School
East 4th Street
Glenwood, Iowa 51534
- 37 William F. Baretich, Principal
Eagle Grove Comm. School District
Eagle Grove High School
Eagle Grove, Iowa 50533
- 38 Jean Edward Wilkins
Pella High School
E. 212 University Street
Pella, Iowa 50219

- 39 James Pearson
Camanche High School
1400 9th Avenue
Camanche, Iowa 52730
- 40 Robert Hoogeveen
Sheldon High School
Sheldon, Iowa 51201
- 41 Henry Christowski
Norwalk Senior High School
Norwalk, Iowa 50211
- 42 Robert Schmidt, Principal
Jefferson Comm. School District
Jefferson High School
100 Sunset
Jefferson, Iowa 50129
- 43 Mel Wishman
Carlisle High School
Carlisle, Iowa 50047
- 44 W. B. Ratterree Jr.
Spirit Lake High School
South Hill Avenue
Spirit Lake, Iowa 51360
- 45 Joe Rogers, Principal
Maquoketa Valley Comm. School District
Maquoketa Valley High School
Delhi, Iowa 52223
- 46 Dean Gibney
Central High School
Argyle, Iowa 52619
- 47 Leland Jesse
Jesup High School
Jesup, Iowa 50648
- 48 Roger Horn
West Marshall High School
State Center, Iowa 50247
- 49 Robert Paul
Northeast Community High School
Goose Lake, Iowa 52750
- 50 Ronald Louis Donn
Turkey Valley High School
Jackson Junction, Iowa 52150

- 51 Philip Hintz
Ballard Community High School
Huxley, Iowa 50124
- 52 Robert Martin Murphy
Williamsburg High School
Williamsburg, Iowa 52361
- 53 Adrian C. Ringold, Principal
Mount Vernon Comm. School District
Mount Vernon High School
525 Palisades Road
Mount Vernon, Iowa 52314
- 54 Dean Bolluyt
West Sioux High School
Hawarden, Iowa 51023
- 55 Robert Templeton
North Linn Senior High School
Coggon, Iowa 52218
- 56 William Christensen, Principal
Maple Valley Comm. School District
Maple Valley High School
401 S. 6th
Mapleton, Iowa 51034
- 57 Donald Grove, Principal
Central Clayton Comm. School District
Elkader High School
Elkader, Iowa 52043
- 58 Duane Stanley Munson
Booklyn-Guernsey-Malcom High School
Brooklyn, Iowa 52211
- 59 Phillip Rink
Lake Mills High School
Lake Mills, Iowa 50450
- 60 Donald Southwick
West Monona High School
110 Tenth
Onawa, Iowa 50140
- 61 Robert Snater
Sac Senior High School
Sac City, Iowa 50583

- 62 Jack Dorothy
Van Buren High School
Keosauqua, Iowa 52565
- 63 Maynord Gene Lust, Principal
LaPorte City Comm. School District
LaPorte City High School
200 Adams Street
LaPorte City, Iowa 50651
- 64 Donald Cleveland, Principal
Belmond Comm. School District
Belmond Community High School
Belmond, Iowa 50421
- 65 Lloyd Walter Koob
Nashua Senior High School
Nashua, Iowa 50658
- 66 Jack Poe
Wapello Senior High School
Wapello, Iowa 52653
- 67 Vincent Meyer
Waukee Senior High School
Waukee, Iowa 50263
- 68 Gary Ratigan
Tri Center High School
Neola, Iowa 51559
- 69 John Bohy
Bellevue High School
Bellevue, Iowa 52031
- 70 Cyril Barnes
Tiffin High School
Tiffin, Iowa 52340
- 71 Lee Arrowsmith
South Winneshiek Senior High School
Calmar, Iowa 52132
- 71 Bill Diederich
Riceville High School
Riceville, Iowa 50466
- 73 Richard Waters
Corning High School
Corning, Iowa 50841

- 74 Roland F. Hansen, Principal
Belle Plaine Comm. School District
Belle Plaine Senior High School
13th Avenue
Belle Plaine, Iowa 52208
- 75 Harold Fishback
Guttenberg High School
Guttenberg, Iowa 52052
- 76 Mervin R. Fry, Principal
Durant Comm. School District
Durant High School
408 7th Street
Durant, Iowa 52747
- 77 Donald Kuchel
Westwood High School
Sloan, Iowa 51055
- 78 Richard Donald Pyner
Wayne Community High School
Corydon, Iowa 50060
- 79 Robert Leroy Clark
North Tama High School
Traer, Iowa 50675
- 80 Larry Walker
South East Warren High School
Liberty Center, Iowa 50145
- 81 Jack F. Fisher, Principal
Britt Comm. School District
Britt Secondary School
Britt, Iowa 50423
- 82 Bill Admas
Central High School
Leon, Iowa 50144
- 83 Leroy E. Anderson, Principal
Maurice-Orange City Comm. School District
Maurice-Orange City High School
615 Eighth Street Southeast
Orange City, Iowa 50141
- 84 David Lau
Edgewood Colesburg Senior High School
Edgewood, Iowa 52042

- 85 Patrick Minnick
Rockwell City Senior High School
Rockwell City, Iowa 50579
- 87 John Frost, Principal
Ida Grove Community School District
Ida Grove Senior High School
Ida Grove, Iowa 51445
- 88 Ray Lehto, Principal
Greenfield Comm. School District
Greenfield High School
306 Southwest Second
Greenfield, Iowa 50849
- 89 Wm. Baldwin
East Union Senior High School
Afton, Iowa 50830
- 90 Allen Edwards
West Central High School
Maynard, Iowa 50655
- 91 William Tyne
East Central High School
Miles, Iowa 52064
- 92 Terrill Premus
Pocahontas High School
Pocahontas, Iowa 50574
- 93 Jim Whalen
Springville High School
Springville, Iowa 52336
- 94 Lee Burns
Lawton Bronson High School
Lawton, Iowa 51030
- 95 Jerry C. Richardson, Principal
Logan-Magnolia Comm. School District
Logan-Magnolia Junior-Senior High School
130 W. 4th
Logan, Iowa 51546
- 96 Franklin Richards
Reinbeck High School
Reinbeck, Iowa 50669
- 97 Howard Kyle, Principal
Milford Comm. School District
Milford High School
Box 147
Milford, Iowa 51351

- 98 Warren Davison
Bondurant Farrar High School
Bondurant, Iowa 50035
- 99 Edwin Shank
Dunkerton Senior High School
Dunkerton, Iowa 50626
- 100 Louis Grimm
Lincoln Senior High School
Stanwood, Iowa 52337
- 101 Darrell Brand
Montezume High School
Montezuma, Iowa 50171
- 102 Roy Roed
Woodbine High School
Woodbine, Iowa 51579
- 103 Elvin McCurdy
Lynnville Sully High School
Sully, Iowa 50251
- 104 Charles Lorber
New London Senior High School
New London, Iowa 52645
- 105 James Kerns
Odebolt Arthur High School
Odebolt, Iowa 51458
- 106 Forrest McElmuray
West Harrison High School
Mondamin, Iowa 51557
- 107 Osborne Liaboe
Rock Valley High School
Rock Valley, Iowa 51247
- 108 Jim Munday
Boyden Hull High School
Hull, Iowa 51239
- 109 John Ford
LDF Senior High School
LeGrand, Iowa 50142
- 110 M. Hugh Shaw
Dexfield Senior High School
Redfield, Iowa 50233

- 111 Willis Hoff
Akron Comm. School District
Kerr Drive
Akron, Iowa 51001
- 112 Francis Jones
Laurens High School
Laurens, Iowa 50554
- 113 Robert Conway
Parkersburg High School
Parkersburg, Iowa 50665
- 114 Richard Merkle
Oakland Senior High School
Oakland, Iowa 51560
- 115 Kenneth Vance
Preston High School
Preston, Iowa 52069
- 116 James Altwegg
Dunlap Senior High School
Dunlap, Iowa 51529
- 117 Ron Wuebben
Aurelia High School
Aurelia, Iowa 51005
- 118 Omer Troyer
Anita Senior High School
Anita, Iowa 50020
- 119 Hilmer Hafner
Panora Linden High School
Panora, Iowa 50216
- 120 Robert Janka
Hinton High School
Hinton, Iowa 51024
- 121 Albert Wood
Lisbon High School
Lisbon, Iowa 52253
- 122 Jack Padilla
Earlham Senior High School
Earlham, Iowa 50072
- 123 Robert Meek
Garnavillo Senior High School
Garnavillo, Iowa 52049

- 124 Ronald Miller
Danville Senior High School
Danville, Iowa 52623
- 125 Richard Heimer
Sheffield Chapin Senior High School
Sheffield, Iowa 50475
- 126 Tom Loel Tuttle, Principal
Fremont-Mills Comm. School District
Fremont-Mills Junior-Senior High School
Tabor, Iowa 51653
- 127 Ronald Foelske
Aplington High School
Aplington, Iowa 50604
- 128 James Robert Gilpin
Grand Junction High School
Grand Junction, Iowa 50107
- 129 Charles Hatwig
Y J B High School
Jamaica, Iowa 50128
- 130 Grant Stimson
Schleswig Senior High School
Schleswig, Iowa 51461
- 131 Dennis Brechwald
North Winneshiek Senior High School
Decorah, Iowa 52101
- 132 Donald Gerlach, Principal
Armstrong High School
Armstrong, Iowa 50514
- 133 Carroll Taylor
Northeast Hamilton Senior High School
Blairsburg, Iowa 50034
- 134 Gerald Mercer
Tri County High School
Thornburg, Iowa 50255
- 135 Albert Hazelhoff
Ar-We-Va-Community High School
Westside, Iowa 51467

- 136 Karl Kuhlmann
Lone Tree Senior High School
Lone Tree, Iowa 52755
- 137 Kyle Chaska
Lenox High School
Lenox, Iowa 50851
- 138 Gaylen Frantz
Glidden Ralston High School
Glidden, Iowa 51443
- 139 Dick Hulst
Floyd Valley High School
Alton, Iowa 51003
- 140 Joseph Kane
Remsen Union High School
Remsen, Iowa 51050
- 141 Renner Ventling
Anthon Oto Senior High School
Anthon, Iowa 51004
- 142 Edward Bollinger
Alden High School
Alden, Iowa 50006
- 143 Alyn J. Teater, Principal
Moravia Comm. School District
Moravia High School
Moravia, Iowa 52571
- 144 Richard Bachman
New Hartford Senior High School
New Hartford, Iowa 50660
- 145 Alan Rowe
Norway High School
Norway, Iowa 52318
- 146 William Cook
Plainfield Senior High School
Plainfield, Iowa 50666
- 147 Robert Welsch
Elk Horn Kimballton High School
Elk Horn, Iowa 51531
- 148 Larry Johnson
Everly Senior High School
Everly, Iowa 51338

- 149 Dyle Frank Martin
Ventura Senior High School
Ventura, Iowa 50482
- 150 Paul Oliphant
Irwin High School
Irwin, Iowa 51446
- 151 Kenneth Walter
United Senior High School
Boone, Iowa 50036
- 152 Donald Lee
Nishna Valley Senior High School
Hastings, Iowa 51540
- 153 Loren Mortvedt
Olin Senior High School
Olin, Iowa 52320
- 154 George Rhoads
Wheatland High School
Wheatland, Iowa 52777
- 155 Gene Keith Morlan
Moulton Udell High School
Moulton, Iowa 52572
- 156 Lynn Hansen
Swea City Senior High School
Swea City, Iowa 50590
- 157 William Walsh
Willow Community High School
Quimby, Iowa 51049
- 158 W. Raymond Miller Jr.
Newell Providence Senior High School
Newell, Iowa 50568
- 159 Harold Keplinger
Radcliffe Senior High School
Radcliffe, Iowa 50230
- 160 Gary Peterson
Sentral Senior High School
Fenton, Iowa 50539
- 161 Jim Taylor
Schaller High School
Schaller, Iowa 51053

- 162 Wayne Remme
Sanborn Senior High School
Sanborn, Iowa 51248
- 163 Harold Pruin
Van Meter Senior High School
Van Meter, Iowa 50261
- 164 Lowell Wedgbury
Central Dallas Senior High School
Minburn, Iowa 50167
- 165 Larry Shay
Shellsburg High School
Shellsburg, Iowa 52332
- 166 Robert H. Bassett
Corwith Wesley High School
Corwith, Iowa 50430
- 167 Allyn Sogard
South Clay High School
Gillett Grove, Iowa 51341
- 168 Clarence Devine
Stratford High School
Stratford, Iowa 50249
- 169 Earl Oleson
Cedar Valley High School
Somers, Iowa 50586
- 170 Floyd Ruhl
Essex Senior High School
Essex, Iowa 51638
- 171 Patrick Sullivan
Maxwell High School
Maxwell, Iowa 50161
- 172 Richard Lowery
Scranton Senior High School
Scranton, Iowa 51462
- 173 Thomas Maller
Battle Creek Senior High School
Battle Creek, Iowa 51006
- 174 Gary Mohl
Lost Nation Senior High School
Lost Nation, Iowa 52254

- 175 Richard Larson, Principal
Dows Comm. School District
Dows Junior-Senior High School
Dows, Iowa 50071
- 176 Homer Mileham
Garwin Senior High
Garwin, Iowa 50632
- 177 Gerald Brown
Murray Senior High School
Murray, Iowa 50174
- 178 Norman Miller
East Monona High School
Moorhead, Iowa 51558
- 179 James Pasut
Blakesburg High School
Blakesburg, Iowa 52536
- 180 Vincent Pavlik
Westfield High School
Westfield, Iowa 51062
- 181 Lloyd Gayman
Lincoln Central High School
Gruver, Iowa 51344
- 182 Kenneth Northrup
Whiting High School
Whiting, Iowa 51063
- 183 Harold Adams
Grand Valley High School
Kellerton, Iowa 50133
- 184 Eugene C. Johnson
Ruthven High School
Ruthven, Iowa 51358
- 185 Principal
Deep River Millersburg High School
Millersburg, Iowa 52308
- 186 William Hasenwinkel
Klemme Senior High School
Klemme, Iowa 50449

- 187 Morris Johnson
Sioux Rapids High School
Sioux Rapids, Iowa 50585
- 188 Albert Carr
Bayard Senior High School
Bayard, Iowa 50029
- 189 William Mertens
Fox Valley High School
Milton, Iowa 52570
- 190 Maurice Miller
Goldfield Senior High School
Goldfield, Iowa 50542
- 191 John Delong
Oxford Junction High School
Oxford Junction, Iowa 52323
- 192 John Feuerstein
Luverne High School
Luverne, Iowa 50560
- 193 Principal
Ayrshire High School
Ayrshire, Iowa 50515
- 194 Tony Sebben
Galva High School
Galva, Iowa 51020
- 195 John Doversberger
Ocheyedan Senior High School
Ocheyedan, Iowa 51354
- 196 John Edward Phillips
Fremont High School
Tabor, Iowa 51653
- 197 Robert Rampulia
Collins Senior High School
Collins, Iowa 50055
- 198 Rodney Johnson
Lakota High School
Lakota, Iowa 50451
- 199 Francis Johnson
Melvin Senior High School
Melvin, Iowa 51350

- 200 George Bergmann
Rake Senior High School
Rake, Iowa 50465
- 201 William R. Baas
Dowling High School
1400 Buffalo Road
Des Moines, Iowa 50317
- 202 Rev. Walter Brunkan
Columbus High School
3231 West Ninth
Waterloo, Iowa 50702
- 203 Ross Nielsen
Price Laboratory School
19th and Campus
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613
- 204 Donald Klein
Regis High School
735 Prairie Drive N.E.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402
- 205 Gehlen Catholic School Inc.
709 Plymouth Street N.E.
LeMars, Iowa 51031
- 206 Rev. Kenneth Gehling
St. John High School
301 4th Avenue
Independence, Iowa 50644
- 207 John P. Lepetit
Regina High School
2150 Rochester Avenue
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
- 208 Sister Margaret Hennigan
St. Mary High School
525 Eighth Avenue South
Clinton, Iowa 52732
- 209 Paul DeJong
Pella Christian High School
Pella, Iowa 50219
- 210 Rev. John R. McClean
Newman High School
2445 19th S.W.
Mason City, Iowa 50401

- 211 Marion D. Van Soelen
Unity Christian High School
Orange City, Iowa 51041
- 212 Rev. Gerald Condon
Don Bosco High School
Gilbertville, Iowa 50634
- 213 Rev. John Hyland
Acquinas High School
2600 Avenue A
Fort Madison, Iowa 52627
- 214 Rev. Michael Larkin
Spalding High School
Granville, Iowa 51022
- 215 Rev. Roger Augustine
St. Mary High School
Storm Lake, Iowa 50588
- 216 Calvin Graber
Iowa Mennonite School
Kalona, Iowa 52247
- 217 M. E. Brass
Oak Park Academy
Nevada, Iowa 50201
- 218 Jon Brissman
Kingsway Christian
907 19th
Des Moines, Iowa 50314
- 219 Sister Mary Meyer
St. Clare Academy
400 N. Bluff Blvd.
Clinton, Iowa 52732

APPENDIX C

**ORIGINAL LETTER TO PRINCIPALS AND
FOLLOW-UP LETTER**

May 14, 1975

Dear Principal:

I am sending this letter as a followup to the letter I sent you April 30, 1975. As of today I have received a 60 percent return of the 229 high schools. I need a 77 percent return in order to make the study significant.

I need your help! I have enclosed another questionnaire for your convenience. Hopefully, you have the self-addressed envelope I sent out in the first letter. Your response is very important in determining the teacher evaluation practices and attitudes of secondary principals in the state of Iowa.

Thanks for your cooperation, as I know you are very busy now. I hope I can repay the favor someday.

Sincerely,

Larry Beard, Principal
South Hamilton Junior-
Senior High School
Jewell, Iowa 50130

Phone: 515-827-5418

Encl. 1

April 30, 1975

Dear Principal:

I realize that this is a very busy time for you, but I would like to request your cooperation in conducting a study of teacher evaluation in Iowa. This study is being conducted with 229 high schools in the state of Iowa selected by random sample. Your participation will help to ensure the accuracy of the results.

Enclosed is a questionnaire with 28 major items. You are to respond to each item as it pertains to your specific situation. In addition, you are asked to indicate the importance of each item. Your response will help determine the teacher evaluation practices and attitudes of secondary principals in the state of Iowa.

Your name or the name of the school will not be published or made known to anyone. Each questionnaire is identified by a number. This number is for the purpose of identifying the schools that have responded to the questionnaire. When you complete the questionnaire, please send it back in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please indicate at the end of the questionnaire under "Additional Comments." Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Larry Beard, Principal
South Hamilton Community Schools
Jewell, Iowa 50130

Phone: 515-827-5418